This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

ANDOVER-HARVARD
THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY

A

REVIEW

OF

REV. JOHN H. POWER'S

EXPOSITION OF UNIVERSALISM:

COMMENCED BY

THE LATE REV. GEORGE ROGERS,

AND FINISHED BY

REV. E. M. PINGREE.

BUBLISHED BY J. A. GURLEY,
CINCINNATI:
.....
1847.

BX
9947
.P6
R6
cop. 2

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the
year 1847, by
JOHN A. GURLEY,
in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the
United States, in and for the District of Ohio.

PREFACE.

The work of which this is a review has been for several years before the public, and, by the Methodist portion thereof, would seem to be held in high estimation. The reviewer, meanwhile, has several times looked over its pages, in order to form a judgment of its character; his estimate in each case was too low, as to its strength of argument, candor of tone, correctness of style, &c., to induce him to subject it to a published refutation. He now, at length, does so, more because of the place it seems to hold in the polemical literature of the author's denomination, than from any change of opinion in his own mind concerning it. He confesses that he enters upon the work of reviewing it with no great zest. Mr. Power's book is characterized by such an *excess* of wordiness that it would well admit of being reduced to half its bulk, without being thereby in the slightest degree impaired, as

to its matter of statement, exposition, or argument. This will account why this review is compressed within a bulk so much less than that of the work reviewed. The reviewer has no fondness for verbiage; he conceives himself as having a plain mission to plain people, and his wish is to discharge it with as little waste of time and words as possible. GEORGE ROGERS.

REVIEW

OF

POWER ON UNIVERSALISM.

INTRODUCTORY CHAPTER.

In the author I am about to review there are several peculiarities, which render the task of reviewing him both an unpleasant and a difficult one. The most prominent of these is his excessive, and often meaningless, verbiage. Think of an author occupying full 24 duodecimo pages, in attempting to refute the argument for Universalism founded on God's promise to Abraham! This Mr. P. does; and at the end he would be quite safe in defying any reader of healthy intellect to understand what he has written.

Another of his peculiarities is, that he really seems to fancy himself a logician. Under this delusion he goes hugely into the sylogistic process and the *reductio ad absurdum*. There is, to be sure, no marked peculiarity in a man's fancying himself a logician when he is not so: in Mr. P.'s case the peculiarity consists in his thinking so upon so slender a foundation.

HIERONYMUS
ANDOVER-HARVARD
THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY

defect of tyroes in composition—boys, and boarding-school misses.

Mr. P. is not content with saying, "you may consummate the slaughter," &c., it must be "*merciless* slaughter." To "murder the saints of the Most High," is not sufficiently bad—they must be "*cruelly*" murdered. So, too, anarchy must be turned loose—after all the kings of the earth are killed, "with all other civil rulers," and after all human society and government are torn from their foundations! One would suppose that anarchy *was* loose by that time. But no, it must be *turned* loose—and that, too, "to *drive* in *lawless* cruelty," &c. Who ever knew of an anarchy that was not *lawless!* This "drive," moreover, was to be performed "over a *prostrate* world"—that is, a world lying on its back, or on its face, or prone to the ground in some position. Upon my word, Mr. Anarchy, this drive of yours was a marvelous feat!

Furthermore, after breaking down God's altars, and turning his sanctuaries into heathen temples, there still remained the crime of *attacking* the throne of God, (after the fashion of the hundred handed Briarius, of old, probably,) of *blaspheming* his existence, after *denying* it! setting at defiance Him who is conceived not to be! and that, too, in the presence of the altars that are previously demolished! and then—as a grand winding up—be rewarded for all this fracas by living

instantly in heaven, besides living in God's eternal sanctuary on high, and living "with all the singing millions" in that same sanctuary, to boot! If the reader can furnish such another example of magniloquent verbiage as this, he must either have got it from a juvenile debating club, or be extensively read in ladies' albums.

One other peculiarity may be specified as characterizing Mr. Power; and that is, his aptitude in discovering obscurities in all the Universalist authors he quotes, when, in fact, it must be evident to all readers that the obscurity complained of is in his own brain. This trait in his book has raised the question in my mind, whether Mr. P. is indeed so very deficient in his perceptive faculties, or whether he merely *feigns* this obtusity, for the purpose of impressing his readers with the opinion, that Universalist writers either *can* not or *will* not render themselves intelligible. I should be sorry to deem so meanly of his morality as to decide the latter to be the case; to an imbecility of intellect no blame can attach; but for an obliquity of moral principle the minister of religion can frame no excuse that will acquit him at the bar of the public judgment.

Among the Universalist quotations he furnishes is a lengthy one from Mr. Thomas—taken from his discussion with Dr. Ely—than which, I take it on me to say, that Mr. P. cannot produce from the whole field of his

theological reading a passage more direct, lucid, and concise. Let him search amongst the twistical theologians of his own school, and see. Truth is—and Mr. P. must feel it—there exists between the common sense of mankind and the tortuous arminian divinity, no such direct relation as is evinced to exist, in Mr. Thomas' article, between that common sense and Universalism. Mr. P. however, feigns to find some obscurity, even in that perspicuous passage. We shall see, in the proper place, precisely where the fog in question is to be found, and in what it consists.

CHAPTER II.

A preliminary point settled—Universalism defined—Mr. Ballou's concession—The positions of Universalism stated—Universalism bears all the characteristic marks of error.

Of Universalism Mr. Power says, "If it be the doctrine of the Bible, it is reasonable to suppose that it is susceptible of proof from the sacred record, as clear as the interests involved are important. In the absence of such proof, all will be justifiable in rejecting the doctrine if it were but a harmless error; much more when it is seen to be an error of the most fearful character."

On this I remark, if the belief that the infinite and all-merciful Father will eventually purify and bless all his offspring, needs to be clearly and emphatically warranted, how much more the notion, that he will consign innumerable millions of them to unending blasphemies and unquenchable fires! The former, one would think, *might* reasonably be believed upon very slight *direct* authority; whereas for the latter—as it seems so dissonant with God's benevolent relations to man, and his purpose in creating him—we should demand a warrant as clear and undoubted as the existence of the sun in heaven.

Mr. P., we will suppose, is the father of

a numerous family; he writes a book for their enlightenment as to his character, their duties toward him and one another; and his ultimate intentions toward them. Saith one of those children, "Except we find it clearly revealed in our father's book, that he will do for us all eventually the best he possibly can do, we shall not be justifiable in so believing; on the contrary, we shall have reason to apprehend that he will abandon the guilty portion of us to a ruin from which there will be no recovery, and no benefit to either himself or us." Would Mr. P. have cause to deem himself highly complimented by this judgment on the part of his child?

Now, it is but *changing the terms* of Universalism—not at all *altering its sense*—to say that the Bible warrants the belief that the Eternal Father will do for all his offspring, eventually, *the best he possibly can do*. Will Mr. P. risk a denial of this? I press this question upon his inmost conscience—I demand of him to tell us, if God will *not* not do, even for the sinner, the best he possibly can—what *will* he do for him? Will he do the *worst* he possibly can do? If a consignment to endless groans and blasphemies is *not* the worst—will he help us to an idea of something that *is*? Except then, saith, substantially, Mr. P., we find in the Bible the most clear and unequivocal revelation to the contrary, we must infer therefrom that Jehovah will do for his sinful chil-

dren the very worst that he possibly can do!

I am aware that it may be plead, that the Almighty will not do the worst he can for the sinner, until, during his mortal life, he has tried to do something better for him. Well, let Arminianism have the benefit of this plea. The case, then, stands thus.—During the sinner's mortal life God endeavors to do for him the *best* he can; but after death, and thence forward forever, he does for him the very *worst* he can! In whom is the great change, then,—in God or in the sinner? Mr. P. will not like to grant that the sinner changes at death—he is a sinner still—nor can death possibly have made him more of one than before. Yet the infinite, and unchangeable Jehovah, who formerly loved, and did FOR him all he could, now abandons, and does AGAINST him all he can! Until Mr. P. can fairly grapple with difficulties like these in his own rotten system, his arguments against Universalism can as little affect it as can the ocean's foam the rock against which it dashes.

Universalism Defined. Upon this head Mr. P. feigns that great difficulty exists; whether it arises from an inherent undefinability of the system, or from a want of honesty on the part of its doctors, he seems for a while unable to decide. However, he settles it at length in a way quite consonant with his pretensions as a gentleman and a Christian, namely, by setting all Universal-

ist preachers and authors down as a set of knaves. With a view to illustrate this, and to exhibit the utter confusion and obscurity by which our views are characterised, he furnishes several extracts from our writers.

The first of these is from a weekly paper; the writer is making no attempt even to state the Universalist faith, much less to define it; he is treating merely of differences which exist among us as to the *time* and *mode* of punishment. Some of us, for example, believe that *all* punishment is experienced in this life. Others, that a part thereof may be experienced after death. Of those who are embraced in the latter class, some think that they find express teaching to that effect in the Bible; while others think the Bible merely affords an inference that way, and others, again, that it does neither, and they, therefore, hold to the notion of after-death punishment on grounds of reason alone, &c. The writer exhorts that these minor differences be allowed to sleep, rather than that they should occasion party divisions among brethren who all fully unite on the grand central truth, that all punishment shall eventually cease, and issue in the best good of the punished.

Now what, under the canopy, had this to do with Mr. Power's professed object—which was to find a summary of the Universalist belief? If it was his aim to get up an odium against us, on the score of our

divers thinkings in regard to minor points of faith, why, doubtless, the quotation was to his purpose; but as Mr. P. is a Christian minister, it might be slander to charge him with an object so base.

His second quotation is from A. C. Thomas; the optics that discover obscurity in this, must need to be cleansed of the dust of prejudice me thinks. Why, it is the plainest dealing imaginable. "I shall give you my own views," says Mr. T., "premising that they are the views of a large majority of American Universalists. 1st. I believe that God will render to every man according to his deeds—that is, according to *his own* deeds. Rom. ii. 6; consequently, I reject the doctrine of *vicarious* atonement. 2d. I believe that the righteous shall be recompensed IN THE EARTH, *much more* the wicked and the sinner. Prov. xi. 37; consequently, I believe that the Bible furnishes no evidence of punishment beyond the present life. 3d. I believe that "God will reconcile all things to himself," that "God may be all in all." Col. i. 20; 1 Cor. xv. 28; and this salvation I believe to be "the gift of God; not of works lest any man should boast." Ephe. ii. 3, 9." Now, in candor's name, is this the language of one who wished to conceal his opinions? Is there any mincing—any circumlocution here? Yet, be it observed, the quotation is taken from a discussion of the doctrine

of Universal Salvation as opposed to that of endless misery; it therefore professes to define the former *in as far as it came fairly within that issue.*

Mr. P. next gives us an extract from "Ballou on the Atonement." What purpose he had to serve in furnishing that particular extract, he, perhaps, knows, but it surely had nothing to do with his *professed* object. Will he dare affirm that "Ballou on Atonement," does not, in a most lucid manner, express the views of the denomination as to the Trinity, the Atonement, Native Depravity, Free Agency, and Endless Punishment? Will he say that any disguise is sought to be used in relation to these points? He knows that he cannot so affirm. Is he not, then, playing a deceitful game with his reader? Or is there, according to his morality, no deceit in affecting to be in search of our views among our own authors, and, while he everywhere finds them lucidly set forth, to pretend that he cannot possibly find them, on account of our determination to keep them concealed? In the chanceries of heaven and earth such a course must be stamped as fraudulent—whether practised by saint or sinner.

Let us see, now, what base purpose Mr. P. had behind all this; it is divulged in the following extract from his book, page 18.

"There are but few impartial readers, who, after examining the above quotations, with all the Uni-

versalist writers they may choose to consult, and marking the contradictory statements, and conflicting speculations, together with the general obscurity that shrouds the whole system, will not arrive at one of the following conclusions; that is,

1. Universalism is incapable of being clearly defined and intelligibly stated; or,

2. Those who are its most able and zealous advocates, are unwilling to make the development.

If the first be true, it is strong presumptive evidence against the whole system, that it is not of God, but an earth-born scheme, full of deadly moral poison. If the second be true, to say the least, it reflects no honor on its advocates; and with many must subject them to the charge of being false to their system."

But suppose neither be true, how then? And suppose this parade of pretending to seek an exposition of our system, should be seen to be a malicious trick on Mr. Power's part, designed to impress the public with the belief that the Universalist body are playing false with their consciences, with mankind, and with God. Will Mr. P. be likely to gain much credit by such a discovery? I trow not.

If "Universalism is incapable of being clearly defined, and intelligibly stated," quoth Mr. P., "it is strong presumptive evidence that it is not of God, but is an earth-born scheme, full of deadly moral poison." It might be doubtful whether the spirituality of God can be "clearly defined; or the co-subsistence of two natures in man. But we will pass these. Is Methodism willing to go to trial on this ground?

Let us see, then, how she will come out.

We will take the one item of *Vicarious Atonement*. It affirms that the second person in the Trinity died to reconcile the First. (See Art. 2d in Methodist Discipline, page—) We hence learn 1stly : that there *is* in the Godhead a Second Person, distinct from the First and Third. 2dly. The First Person *can* be unreconciled, while the Second and Third are not so. 3rdly. The Second Person *can* associate himself with humanity, and die, while the other two remain as before—except that the First has a certain infinite dissatisfaction removed by the arrangement. 4thly. Nevertheless, the Second Person, who died, is identical with the First, whom he died to reconcile ; and the Third Person, who neither died, nor required to be reconciled, is identical with the other two. If this is clear, then midnight has no darkness, and the fogs of Newfoundland no obscurity. Still, if the reader infers that Methodism "is an earth-born scheme, full of moral poison," he must base his conclusion on Mr. P.'s logic, not on mine.

Mr. Ballou's Concession. In these headings I follow Mr. Power's book; I know not for my own part, why what Mr. Ballou says in the following extract should be termed a "concession"—I see not what is conceded.

"I have been often solicited to write and publish my general ideas on the Gospel, but have common-

ly observed to my friends, that it might be attended with disagreeable consequences, as it is impossible to determine whether the ideas we entertain at the present time, are agreeable to those which we shall be under the necessity of adopting, after we have had more experience; and knowing to my satisfaction, that authors are very liable to feel such an attachment to sentiments which they have openly avowed to the world, that their prejudice frequently obstructs their further acquisitions in the knowledge of the] truth; and even in cases of conviction, their own self-importance will keep them from acknowledging their mistakes; and having some knowledge of my own infirmities, I felt the necessity of precaution, which I have no reason to believe is, or has been, injurious." Ballou on the Atonement, p. 12.

"Here, indeed," says Mr. Powers, "is a solution, to some extent, of the difficulty—a key to the mystery. Mr. B. found it "impossible to determine" whether the "ideas" he entertained, were agreeable to those he would be under the "*necessity*" of adopting, after he should have more experience in the matter. And his brethren have found it convenient to adopt the same principle, doubtless for the same reason; knowing that it is much easier to evade an argument, or change a position, on a point obscurely stated, than it is to defend an absurdity, or renounce an error that has been clearly and unequivocally expressed.

"But, after all, Mr. B. deserves the thanks of all the candid for so much of a concession; and we award it to him.

"But let us look at his concession a little further. Mr. B., and all who act on the same principle, either did, or did not, suppose that his "ideas" of the "Gospel," were founded on the word of God. If he did not, then the acknowledgement implies that it was possible, if not indeed probable, that all his speculations might be false, and he be driven from them by the force of argument and the Bible, and

be under the "necessity" of changing his ground, or giving up his speculations. If he supposed that his "ideas" were founded on the Scripture, then it would appear that it was doubtful whether he understood the Bible on the great subject of salvation; though the Book says, with reference, doubtless, to the fundamental truths and doctrines of salvation, "The wayfaring men, though fools, shall not err therein." Isa. xxxv, 8. But most probably Mr. B. designed nothing more than that Universalists must be very cautious how they commit themselves with regard to the system—never to take a position on which they cannot change their ground of attack, or defense, as often as they are foiled by argument, or opposed by the word of God. We are inclined to the opinion that this was what Mr. B. meant, from the fact that he is quoted by his brethren as an oracle; and as far as has come under our notice, Universalists act fully upon this principle. From the above view it will be hard to resist the conviction, that the friends and advocates of the system have either not understood the subject, or that it cannot be clearly and intelligibly stated, or they have taken pains to conceal many of its features from the public. That the latter is the fact, few will doubt, who are well acquainted with all the subtilties and legitimate consequences of the system." pp. 19, 20.

Reader; *candid* reader; of whatsoever sect you be, I desire that you will look at Mr. Ballou's language and sentiments in the above, with the eyes of an honest man.—Have you done so? Tell me, then, do they not evince a noble modesty and moderation on his part, such as are seldom exhibited by leading men in religious sects? Mr. Ballou knew himself to be fallible; he knew that an inordinate attachment to a system of

his own framing, *might* operate as an obstacle to prevent his availing of new discoveries in Bible truth; he knew it *might* wed him undivorcibly to errors once adopted; that such had been the case with theological system-builders, he had every reason to believe, and he had the modesty to believe that he was as liable to such infirmity as others. Mr. Power, however, has no appreciation of this diffidence so characteristic of great minds. And who will blame the gill-measure for its incapacity to contain a gallon. What better could he do than to estimate others by what he knew of himself?

Look, now, at his *reasoning* on the case; it is a precious piece of twattle. This is its amount: Either Mr. B. supposed his ideas founded on the Bible, or he did not. If he did not, he feared he might have to give them up some day. If he did—what then? Why, then, I suppose, he must of necessity *always* think so, and never, by farther acquaintance with the Bible, be brought to entertain a suspicion to the contrary? The reader shall judge whether the humble inquirer after truth, or the self-sufficient and infallible sectarist, more peeps out in this.

THE POSITIONS OF UNIVERSALISM STATED. The reader is scarcely prepared to be told—after all that Mr. P. says about the undefinability of Universalism—that he himself fully defines it, both as to what it is, and

what it is not; doubtless the unsophisticated reader, unpracticed in the wicked maneuvers of polemics, will be quite unprepared for this announcement. Yet such is the fact!

If the man deemed that he could better define our system than any, or all together, of our best preachers and authors, God help his *vanity!* But if his supposition was, that we all of us lacked the *honesty* to do what he has done for us, then God help his *charity!*—for, his own doctrine being true, he has scarcely more of that grace than will suffice to save him, methinks.

Here follows his summary of our faith; it is characterized by his usual prolixity, and is couched in terms somewhat different from what our own writers usually employ. Nevertheless, it is correct as to its sense, with the exception of the 3rd negative position. Without *means*, we say, no *end* is ever effected. We, therefore, do not exclude the agency of means, in the final salvation of man. Nevertheless, even this article may pass, provided that Art. VII. be taken as its exposition. But Art. IX. is more seriously faulty. We construe the history of the fall as a *fact*—not a *fable*, nor *allegory;* but we conceive the *mode* of that transaction to be allegorically represented by the historian.

I. "Universalism maintains that the whole human family, including each individual member thereof, will be brought unconditionally, and without the possibility of a failure, into a state of eternal salvation and glory in heaven."

II. "Universalism holds that the general judgment, or all the judgment taught in the Scriptures, takes place in this world, and cannot possibly extend into the future world."

III. "Universalism maintains that every sinner will be punished in this world in exact proportion to the number and magnitude of his sins, according to the decisions of the justice of God: and that the righteous shall be rewarded also in this world, for all their sufferings and piety."

IV. "Universalism maintains that there will be a general resurrection of the dead, at which time every human being will be raised in immortality, purity, and glory; and every knee shall bow, every tongue confess, all tears be wiped away, and all mankind be endlessly happy in heaven."

We present, secondly, the negative positions of Universalism.

I. "Universalism rejects the doctrine of a future general judgment, in which all angelic and human beings, including the morally good and bad, will be judged according to their moral character and works; and the morally good and holy be rewarded with everlasting happiness in heaven, and the morally bad and unholy be endlessly punished in hell."

II. "Universalism denies that the most deep-settled and confirmed depravity of the human heart—the most abandoned wickedness of life, together with the most stubborn unbelief in death, can by any possibility prevent, or in any wise endanger, the ultimate holiness and happiness of man in heaven."

III. "The system denies that reformation, faith, and love, or holiness of heart and life in this world, are at all essential as a condition, or means, to secure endless happiness in the future world."

IV. "It denies that God ever has pardoned, or ever will pardon, one sin committed by man in this world; that is, in the sense of remitting the punishment, or any part thereof."

V. "Universalism denies the unoriginated and in-

finite divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Ghost."

VI. "The system having rejected the absolute divinity of Jesus Christ, as a matter of course, and a necessary consequence, denies the vicarious sufferings and atonement of the Savior."

VII. "Universalism denies and rejects all conditionality, as it regards man's future and final salvation; that is, that there is any condition, act, or work which man can perform, or the utter neglect of which by him, can at all endanger his ultimate salvation in heaven."

VIII. "As a part of the above feature of the system, and as a necessary consequence, Universalism denies the free moral agency and accountability of man to his Maker; so far, at least, as that free agency can by any means affect his final holiness and happiness in the future world."

IX. "Universalism denies the doctrines of the fall of man, and the consequent hereditary, universal depravity of the human heart, and considers the account of man's apostasy, as recorded in the Bible, to be merely allegorical or figurative." pp. 37, 38, 39.

I pass the above without comment, save by remarking, that Mr. P. might have secured a great economy of paper and letter-press, by the omission of his twattle about our unwillingness to have our real principles exposed. The frank, and unconstrained ratification I have given to the truth of his own statement of our faith, is proof that I, at least, have no such unwillingness, and I am far from deeming myself an exception to the general body in this particular.

Universalism bears all the Characteristic Marks of Error.—"Truth and error," saith Mr. P., "have their character-

istic distinctions. Truth never shrinks from the clearest scrutiny—never withholds explanation, nor seeks concealment. On the contrary, error, however bold and boisterous when it thinks itself out of danger, when called to account evades explanation, retreats into obscurity, and shuns close investigation. Universalism bears all these marks of error, and carries them out in practice," &c., &c.

All true, of course. And, of course, a Methodist preacher is the very one to charge it home upon us. Of course, too, his own system is extremely innocent of any such characteristics. All very much of course; yet, somehow, facts, the stubborn rascals, most perversely conspire to reverse the verdict.

Thus they testify. The Universalists of these United States own meeting houses to the number of seven hundred; to the pulpit of any one of these a respectable minister of any denomination can obtain access, to preach therein whatsoever doctrine he pleases. Mr. Power knows this; he knows that he may obtain the privilege to pronounce against us, from any of our own pulpits, the entire substance of his slanderous book.—Will his own church accord any such privilege to those of different creeds? Will it even grant us one of its pulpits for the purpose of a respectful reply, after we have been assailed therefrom? Mr. Power well

knows that it will not. And, be it observed, this illiberal course proceeds not from an objection to the introduction of polemics into her pulpit. She has no such objection; she merely prefers that, like the handle of a jug, they shall be all on one side.

Again: At this present time there are sixteen weekly papers devoted to the advocacy of Universalism; through the columns of any one of these Mr. P., had he chosen, could have communicated, free of expense, the whole contents of his book. This, also he knows. But, with regard to a like privilege to Universalists in Methodist papers, how stands the case? One brief piece of history shall illustrate.

Some few years ago an agreement for a controversy was entered into between Rev. Pitt Morse, (Universalist,) and Rev. Luther Lee, (Methodist,) it was to consist in an exchange of a given number of letters, of a given length, which were to be published, on both sides, in the Magazine and Advocate, (Universalist paper,) and the Christian Advocate, (Methodist paper,) each of the parties pledging himself for the fidelity of his own party-paper, in respect to the communications of the other. So stood the agreement. Now, then, for an exhibit of the "characteristic marks."

On the Methodist part, *but a single letter on the other side was ever published*, while the whole series on its own side were in-

serted entire, and were even accompanied with puffs, and boastings of their victorious character, on the part of the Methodist editor! Nevertheless, and despite this gross violation of contract, the Universalist paper faithfully fulfilled its part—inserted all Mr. Lee's letters—and even when that gentleman, having got to the end of the matter in issue, continued to write on a point that was foreign thereto—still, an unobstructed admission was given to his articles, and they were allowed to speak for themselves without reply on his opponent's part, or on that of others. Yet—will the reader believe it? —that same Rev. Luther Lee subsequently republished, in book form, the whole of his own side of the controversy—excluding the other—and had the audacity to set forth in his preface, as his apology for adding another to the numerous fry of books against Universalism, that, in the midst of a controversy of that doctrine with one of its advocates, and just as said controversy had reached its most interesting point, he had been *virtually*—mark that word—he had been *virtually* excluded from the Universalist columns! O, Methodism! well is it for thy immaculate children that *impudence* is no bar to an admission to thy heaven, and that nothing but their omission to be "born again" can possibly exclude them!

But further as to these "characteristic marks." Does Mr. Power know of any

Universalist preacher, with whom he may not, when he pleases, hold an open controversy on the doctrine, at any length to which he may wish to extend it? On the other hand, does he not know of scores of Methodist preachers, who *cannot be induced* to engage in such open controversy?—*Open*, I say, for any of them will agree to discuss it *exclusively*. Will a Methodist paper permit even one of its own writers. to canvass in its columns any one of its tenets, if his reasoning reaches a conclusion unfavorable to such tenets? Ah, the truth is, Mr. P. well knows to which of the systems in this issue the "characteristic marks" attach; as a partizan it may be politic for him to throw as much dust as possible in the public's eyes in this respect; but it is a huge presumption on that public's gullability to think of obtaining its credence to the allegation, that whilst Universalism shinks from a full and open investigation of its doctrines, Methodism stands forth, in noble self-reliance, and bares her pure and innocent breast to the most rigorous public scrutiny. Too late in the day for that, Mr. Power.

CHAPTER III.

God's promise to Abraham—Mr. Power's evasion thereof—His criticism tried by its own rule—Curious samples of exposition and reasoning.—A true rule of Scripture exposition established.

God's Promise to Abraham.—Our argument upon this is as follows. 1st. That it is *universal;* for, in its several versions, it is made to embrace all the *nations* of the earth: (Gen. xxii. 18;) all the *families* of the earth: (Gen. xxviii. 14;) and all the *kindreds* of the earth. (Acts iiii. 25) 2nd. That the blessing promised is *spiritual;* for, saith Paul, "And the Scriptures foreseeing that God would *justify the heathen through faith,* preached before the gospel to Abraham," &c. (Gal. iii.) And Peter also saith, "God having raised up his son Jesus, sent him to bless you, *in turning away every one of you from his iniquities.* ☞ And this immediately follows his application to them of God's promise to Abraham. Justifying men through faith, and turning them from their iniquities, implies, we affirm, the doing for them what our doctrine contemplates; viz. the reconciling them to God, and making them happy. 3d. That this blessing to all mankind is promised *in Christ,* (Gal. iii.) and, consequently, is by that circumstance also proved to be not spiritual only,

but also, *absolute*—"for *all* the promises of God in him are yea, and in him Amen." (2 Cor. i. 20.) That is, as the Apostle previously explains, they are not *yea and nay*—they are positive—their fulfillment depending on the faithfulness of Him who hath promised, and, consequently, not liable to frustration by any contingency.

The Arminian, we know, is apt to come in with his, "But suppose all men should not repent—suppose they shall not all believe, &c. We reply, that the case *admits not* of any such supposition. God's promise that the *end* shall positively take place, implies that all the *means* whereby it is to be effected shall be brought into employment by all men. When, for instance, God promised to *justify the heathen through faith*, did he mean, provided they would first, of themselves, come to *possess* faith? When he sent Jesus to turn the wicked Jews from their iniquities, did he limit the blessing to such of them as, of themselves, *forsook* their iniquities? And when God raised up that same Jesus, and empowered him "*to give repentance* to Israel," was it to be conditionally that Israel *would repent?* Truth is, the blessing promised was to consist in God's effecting for all mankind whatever he saw to be essential to their salvation. These essentials are, by Arminians, terms *conditions*, with which man must comply *in this* life, in order to his being saved in another.

We so far agree with them as to term these essentials *means*, which must be brought into requisition either in this life or another, in order to his being saved in either. Their faith is, that although God has promised to bless all—yea, and actually *has blessed all*—yet inconceivable myriads of those same all shall be endlessly cursed. We, on the contrary, stagger not at the promise through unbelief, but in virtue thereof believe that, eventually, "All the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord, and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before him." (Psalm xxii. 28.)

We will see now how Mr. P. manages this case; and I promise the reader quite a treat here, in the way of curious exposition and evasion of the sacred record; I know not where to send him for a match to it. It is here that 24 pages are occupied in the attempt to set aside our argument on the grand gospel promise, and a wordier, or foggier attempt at reasoning, it would puzzle the reader to find in any Dutch annotator, I opine.

Mr. Power's Evasion.—His first evasion consists in his manufacturing for Universalism a certain rendering of the above promise, and then rejecting our deduction therefrom *because the promise does not read according to the identical terms of that rendering!* The rendering which he falsely gets up for us is, that the blessing promised

means, *an absolute and unconditional salvation in heaven.* And know you why he needed this particular rendering? It was for the sake of the inference, that if all are to be saved *in heaven*, they must, of necessity, arrive in heaven *un*-saved. Cute—is it not?

For the same reason he substitutes (as the Universalist rendering) the word heaven for "in this mountain," in the following text: "And in this mountain will the Lord of hosts make unto all people a feast of fat things. * * * And he will destroy in this mountain the face of the covering cast over all people, and the vail spread over all nations. He will swallow up death in victory, and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces. And the rebuke of his people shall he take away from off all the earth," &c. (Isaiah xxv. 6—10.) "It follows," reasoneth Mr. P. "that 'death,' 'tears,' the 'rebuke of God's people,' and 'earth' itself, will all be in heaven. But this is not all, 'For in this mountain [heaven] Moab shall be trodden down under him, even as straw is trodden down for the dunghill.' What splendid scenes does this system attribute to heaven!" It would seem it does, indeed—or else Mr. P. *makes the ascription for it*—which? Such verbal nibblings as these betray either a mind of a low and trifling stamp, or a cause which has no better hope of triumph: such as they are, nevertheless, we

shall pay them some farther compliments by and by.

Another of Mr. Power's evasions consists in shewing, that individuals *have been blessed*—yea, and that nations *have been blessed*—all without being absolutely and unconditionally saved in heaven. Think of that now! And see, ye blinded Universalists, how momentous a conclusion against your wicked system follows. Here it is. Inasmuch as to be blessed does not *always* mean to be finally saved—therefore it does not in God's promise to Abraham!

From this mighty conclusion Mr. P. admits there may, possibly, be one way of escape for us, and that is, we may plead that the blessing of the promise was to be *in Christ*. Even this door of escape, however, he cruelly closes against us, by shewing that to be *blessed in Christ*, means that all our temporal good things—our lives, health, bread-and-butter, knowledge of arithmetic, Methodist preaching and whatsoever else pertains to our condition on earth, are all conferred on us *in*, or *through* Christ. How, now, in the hands of such a miracle of a critic and logician as this, *is* Universalism to get along?

In all seriousness, reader, the above—though presented in burlesque form—is in reality Mr. P.'s position. According to him, for all mankind to be *blessed in Christ*, is for all mankind to receive their natural lives, with the means and chances of eternal sal-

vation thereafter. Otherwise the original pair would have perished, and the race which have sprung from them would not have been generated. Now, as with the means and chances of eternal *salvation*, are also associated the means and chances of eternal *damnation*, and as, from all we have yet seen or now see, much the most part of mankind fall victims to the latter, it is to be doubted whether mankind, on the whole, would not have been better off without the blessing than with it.

Take a single case. A child is born, and its first employment is to weep; it inherits total depravity from the birth; it may also inherit a sickly constitution, which will be to it a source of pain through life; when, in his riper years, truth presses her claims upon his attention, his liabilities to miss of finding it are at least equal to his chances of success; yet if he fail in that particular, in addition to "all the miseries of this life," he must undergo "death itself, and the pains of hell forever." This man, nevertheless, according to Mr. P. is actually one of the *blessed in Christ!* Is he the better, or the worse, for that blessing? Infinitely the worse, the reader will answer. ☞ And the Omniscent God knew he would be so.

But we are not yet done with the absurdities of Mr. P.'s exposition. To bless all mankind in Christ, he thinks, was to preserve Adam and Eve from dying according

to the sentence—to cause an innumerable progeny of human beings to spring from them—and, besides the pleasures and miseries of this life, to grant to that progeny the means and chances of being saved or damned forever. Now reader, look at the phraseology of that promise and see how how well this exposition corresponds therewith." In thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed. That is—taking the whole promise—"In blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of heaven for multitude, and in thee, and in thy seed—Adam and Eve were kept from dying, and their numerous progeny have been, and shall be accommodated with the means and chances of saving or damning themselves forever." Now, that this is his version of the promise, with more fidelity of representation than he has given ours, all readers who are acquainted with our respective systems will admit. He makes our version of the promise to be, "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be —unconditionally saved in heaven"; and all for the sake of manufacturing for us the absurdity, that, if saved *in heaven*, they must be *un*saved on their arrival there, and therefore heaven will then contain unholy beings. A rather *strained* consequence this, if even the premises were true. But, for a refutation of the premises, take his own exposition of Universalism.

"Art. 4. Universalism maintains that there will be a general resurrection of the dead, AT WHICH TIME every human being will be raised in immortality, purity, and glory, and every knee shall bow, every tongue confess, all tears be wiped away, and all mankind be endlessly happy in heaven."

Now as, according to himself, Universalists expect this grand work to be effected in the resurrection, can they, at the same time, expect that it is to be effected in heaven? Certainly not—except they suppose that the resurrection will take place there; and in that case they must suppose that all men arrive *dead* in heaven.*

MR. POWER'S CRITICISM TRIED BY ITSELF. The reader will remember his criticism on the exposition *he manufactures for us*, of the passage in Isaiah xxv. "In this mountain shall the Lord of hosts make unto all people a feast of fat things—wipe tears from all faces—swallow up death in victory—and the rebuke of his people will he take away from off all the earth," &c. In order to re-

* By way of turning the tables on our assailant, it may be remarked, that *he* believes that thousands of even regenerated christians die, without having undergone a cleansing from all their moral impurity. In respect to them, then, *where* will the work of their entire purification be effected? If in heaven, they must be unholy on their arrival there. If in death, or the resurrection, why, at the same time, may not the same work be effected for all men?

duce our exposition to absurdity, he makes us interpret, "in this mountain," as meaning *in heaven*. And so, "it follows," quoth he. "that 'death,' 'tears,' the 'rebuke of God's people,' and 'earth' itself, will all be in heaven. But this is not all. 'For in this mountain [heaven] Moab shall be trodden down under him, even as straw is trodden down for the dunghill.' What splendid scenes does this system attribute to heaven"! &c.

His own exposition is that "this mountain," is "the Zion, or Church of God, the spiritual Jerusalem." Then, according to his criticism, not only are 'tears,' 'death,' &c., but even the 'earth' itself, is in the church—the spiritual Jerusalem; and, in that same church, Moab is to be trodden down as straw for the dunghill. Splendid scenes to take place in the church, one would think! The Moabites were a neighboring nation to the Jews, and were often engaged with them in battle; they have no existence at present. Yet, it seems, they are to be trodden down in 'the church,' or the 'spiritual Jerusalem,' 'as straw is trodden down for the dunghill.' How are these Moabites, so long defunct, to get into the spiritual Jerusalem, I wonder! Thus much to shew how his hypercriticisms may be retorted upon himself.

But suppose Universalists, instead of interpreting "this mountain" to mean heav-

en, really agree with himself in supposing it to mean Zion, or the Spiritual Jerusalem? And suppose that we conceive "Moab" to symbolize whatsoever stands opposed to the final purity of our race, and the harmony of the moral universe? Why, then, Mr. P.'s puissant labors all pass for nothing. He himself has, per force to understand "Moab" to be a figure of *something;* why may it not stand for the type of the foes to man's peace and purity in general? He has furnished no attempt at a reason why it may not.—On the other hand, Paul furnishes good reason why it may; for in his first letter to the Corinthians, 15 Chapter, he expressly alludes to this very passage when treating of the destruction of *all* foes, in connection with the Universal resurrection of man in the image of Christ.—"Then," saith he, "shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory." This identical passage is the only one in the Bible which contains that saying. Now, reader, which has the better shewing of authority for his application of this text, Mr. P. or the Universalists?

For another sample of his astute talent for exposition and flippancy in deducing conclusions, see page 57, where he quotes, or refers to, several texts; among which is Titus, ii. 11, 12. "For the grace of God which bringeth salvation, hath appeared to

all men, teaching us, that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world." On which he remarks, page 57:

"The above Scripture clearly proves, 1. The eternity and omniscience of the Divine Spirit, and consequently, his competency for this great work. 2. That he is sent by the Lord Jesus Christ, to reprove, convince, and enlighten the world. 3. The declarations, "every man," "all men," and "the world," include all nations, families, and kindreds of the earth. 4. That these Divine blessings of God in Christ, through the Holy Ghost, are designed for, and confined to man in this life, according to the language of the testimony itself, that "we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world." From this conclusion Universalism has no escape. If it denies the first, it must contradict the Holy Ghost; if it denies the second, it will contradict Jesus Christ; if it denies the third, it must contradict itself; if it denies the fourth, it will contradict Paul; and, finally, in denying either, it must set the testimony of the word of God at open defiance, and thereby proclaim its own infidelity."

So, then, "the grace of God that bringeth salvation," is, according to Mr. P. "designed for, and *confined to*, man in this life!" And if we deny this, we shall be setting the "word of God at open defiance, and proclaiming our own infidelity." A hard case for us, this. It may be, though, after all, that we shall be merely setting "the word of" *Mr. Power* "at open defiance;" and he has not got to be God yet—though he has got as near to it as to be a Methodist preacher. And pray, Mr. P. why must we

believe that "the grace of God that bringeth salvation," is designed for, and limited to, the present existence? Shall we experience nothing of God's grace in heaven? and if yea, will it be *another* grace from that which "bringeth salvation"? If you base your supposition on its "teaching us, that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly &c, in this present world; all God's attributes conspire to teach us that much. Are *they*, also, confined to this existence? Common sense, me thinks, decides that what that grace of God teaches, is another matter from what it is in itself, or how long it is to be exercised. Suppose I should assert, that Christ's death had for its object simply the delivering of believers from this present evil world? Mr. P. would demand my authority. I give it to him as follows. "Who gave himself for our sins, *that he might deliver us from this present evil world*, according to the will of God our Father." Gal. i. 4. Would not my text immeasurably better bear out my position than Mr. P.'s does his? Nevertheless, he might question the correctness of the inference, without thereby incurring the charge of setting "the word of God at open defiance," or of proclaiming his "own infidelity." A little more modesty on his part might lead him to see, that there is *some* difference between the word of God, and his inferences therefrom.

He closes his second chapter, after a tediously prolix summing up—which I can by no means spare space to copy—in the following strain of Christian mildness." "If, to save an existence, it [Universalism] denies that the death of the Lord Jesus Christ, his light, grace, and mediation, are blessings to mankind in this world, it will thereby take the ground of undisguised infidelity, and should be viewed and treated as such by the christian world."

Suppose we should grant these things to be "blessings to mankind in this life"—would it follow that they are *the* blessing, which God promised to all nations *in* the seed of Abraham? It would at best, be but a temporary, and very questionable benefit (as it regards the great majority) which men receive *by means of* Christ; but would it fulfill the promise that all nations and families of men shall be blessed *in* Christ?—Most clearly not.

But we admit no such thing as is here contended for, except as regards those who, in this life, come to enjoy the light of Christ's Gospel, or to experience the enlightening influence of his principles on the laws and state of society in which they live. With regard to the residue, I deny that Christ's advent has proved a present blessing. Take the Caffres of New South Wales—too ignorant of arts to be able to cover their own nakedness, or to construct habita-

ble shelters; too debased to appreciate the value of personal cleanliness; eating for food the most loathsome reptiles; their minds an almost absolute blank with regard to religion, and so low in the scale of humanity as to beget doubts, in many persons, as to their susceptibility of religious culture. Wherein has Christ's death advantaged *them?*

If it be replied, that but for Christ's death they would have perished in Adam, and so never have seen the light of life, my reply is, 1st, that the assertion is gratuitous; and, 2nd, that, if even true, it will remain to be shown whether *such* a life as theirs, with the liability of their being endlessly damned at the end of it, can be deemed an advantage justifying a very high degree of thankfulness to the Giver? If the liability referred to is denied to exist in regard to them while its existence is admitted in regard to us—then, most clearly it is a pity, according to Methodism, that *all* are not Caffres.

Six hundred millions of human beings, on the earth at this moment, know nothing whatever of Christ, and have heard nothing whatever. To how many of such is Christ's advent a present benefit? One whole generation (with the exception of eight persons) had been swept from the earth in their sins when God made promise to Abraham that all nations should be blessed in Christ. This was in the sixteen hundred and fity-sixth

year of time. If eight persons have since that increased to ten hundred millions, it is safe to presume that two had, till then, increased to two hundred millions—for men lived longer to procreate before the flood than they have since. Mr. P. is forced to admit that this mass of human beings was swept to eternal perdition—for if any of them had been righteous they would have been spared with the eight who were so, and, not being righteous, they were damned—or unrighteous persons go to heaven at death—there is, therefore, no escape from this horrible consequence of his creed. And yet, "if to save an existence, Universalism denies that the death of the Lord Jesus, &c., are blessings to man in this world, it will thereby take the ground of undisguised infidelity, and should be viewed and treated as such by the Christian world." Well, that same Christian world (if it mean the Methodist world) may view and treat us as it likes for that matter; we must bear its scorn as best we may; better that, methinks, than incur the remonstrances of common sense, and the reproaches of conscience, by perverting the promise of God's blessing on mankind, to a meaning that would stamp it as a ceaseless and inconceivable curse.

Mr. Power, "it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks: that promise to Abraham yields not to shallow sophistries like yours: it behooves you, sir, to find or make some

common-sense disposition thereof in harmony with your creed—or to yield up your creed, as of infinitely less worth than heaven's truth; it requires a large charity, sir, to believe you to have been sincere in so futile an attempt as we have now examined, to fritter away a solemn, and oft-repeated promise of Jehovah to all mankind, implying his purpose to bless them in his Son, to the very slight, temporary, and questionable advantage to mankind to which you have sought to reduce it.

CHAPTER IV.

Absolute and conditional promises—A slur at Universalism retorted—The special, in distinction from the common salvation—In what sense was man lost—Mr. Power's inconsistencies.

ABSOLUTE AND CONDITIONAL PROMISES.—Under this head Mr. P. utters a deal of meaningless twattle. He fancies he has discovered a huge distinction, viz., between promises *in the abstract*, and promises in which *something is promised!* The error of Universalists, he thinks, consists of substituting the former, as objects of faith, instead of the latter. This, however, is but the merest verbiage; it is sheer waste of paper and of his reader's time. For will it be believed that Universalists are such idiots as to rest their faith on a promise in which nobody promises, and nothing is promised? The idea is ridiculous. Mr. P.'s distinction exists solely in his own brain.

Now the real issue on this point is as follows: God, say we, in foresight of all contingencies, promised, absolutely, without *ifs*, or other qualifying terms, that he would bless all mankind with certain specified blessings in Christ his Son. These specified blessings are variously set forth in the Scriptures. Christ, in one place, is said to

"*give* repentance, and remission of sins." Acts v. 37. In another, he "*taketh away* the sins of the world." John i. 29. In a third, he "giveth life to the world." John vi. 33. In a fourth he is to draw all men unto himself. In a fifth, he is to "abolish death, and him that had the power of it—and deliver them, who through fear of death, were all their lifetime subject to bondage." Heb. ii. 15, &c. &c. These, and the like texts, imply, as we affirm, an unalterable purpose on God's part, to effect for man through Christ, an entire deliverance from all the evils with which he is now beset.—This justifies Christ's title as "the Savior of the world"—it verifies the promise that the woman's seed should bruise the serpent's head—it makes intelligible the declaration, that how much soever man's sin shall abound, God's grace shall abound much more.

Our opponents affirm, on the other hand, that it is *on certain conditions* that these blessings through Christ are to be bestowed—we are to believe in him, to obey him, to be born again, &c., in order to our experiencing the blessings promised. In proof of this limiting view they cite such texts as—"He that believeth shall be saved"—"That whosoever believeth in him might not perish, but have everlasting life"—"He that hath the Son hath everlasting life, but he that hath not the Son shall not see life, but

the wrath of God abideth on him." &c.—

Here, then, is the issue fairly presented. Let us see, now, if we cannot as fairly decide it. By attentively considering the blessings promised in Christ, it will be perceived that they comprise the *very identical things* on which, our opponents say, the fulfilment of those promises depends. 1st. We are to believe. Can we originate faith in ourselves? No—" it is the gift of God." Ephe. ii. 8. " For to one is given by the spirit the word of wisdom: to another faith, by the same spirit." 1 Cor. xii. 8, 9. 2nd. We are to repent. Can we repent of ourselves? No —Christ is exalted "to *give* repentance," &c. 3d. We are to come to Christ that we may have life. But *can* we come except the Father who sent him draw us?— No—but the declaration of Jesus is, "I will draw all men unto me." 4th. We are to forsake our sins by righteousness," &c. And how is this to be effected?—for—asks Jehovah himself, in reference to this very matter, "Can the Ethiopian change his skin? or the leopard his spots?" Jer. xiii. 23. In what God promised to do for the Jewish people we have a most satisfactory solution of this difficulty. "I will put my law in their mind, and write them in their hearts; and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people. And they shall not teach every man his neighbor, saying, Know the Lord, for all shall know

me, from the least to the greatest. For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and iniquities will I remember no more." Heb. viii. 10, 11, 12. And that what God has thus promised to do for all, is clear from numerous testimonies; particularly from the following. "Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth: for I am God and there is none else. I have sworn by myself, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, That unto me every knee shall bow, and every tongue shall swear, Surely shall say, in the Lord have I righteousness and strength: to him shall men come: and all that are incensed against him shall be ashamed. In the Lord shall all the seed of Israel be justified, and shall glory." Isa. xlv. 22—25.

Seems it not, then, a Scripturally settled point, that what our opponents term *conditions* of salvation, are but *means*, whereby God has determined to save us? God ever effects ends by means—in the moral, as in the physical world. When he determined to restore Hezekiah to health, he appointed that a lump of figs should be laid upon his boil, as a means whereby the end should be effected. You may say, if you please, that had the figs not been applied to the boil, he would have died. True, but God's determinations are formed in view of all contingents—he had infallibly provided that the

figs should be thus employed. This brings me to consider what Mr. P. says of absolute promises.

"By absolute promises," says he, page 74, "must be understood that the thing promised will be performed by the Almighty himself, independent [by] of any necessary agency of man, or any other being." God purposes to redeem the world by his Son. This, at least, was absolute. But was it effected independently of the Son? The absolute purpose of heaven was that Christ should be put to death. Was this effected independently "of man or any other being?" By the absolute purpose of God Abraham was to have a son in his old age, and a numerous nation was to spring from him, including his own Son, the appointed savior of the world. Was all this effected independently of human agency? The very example which Mr. P. cites, as illustrative of the truth of his proposition, illustrates its falsity rather. "The promise of the gift of his Son for the redemption of the world," says he, "the fulfilment of this promise depended alone on the veracity and will of God, and was therefore absolute." Your pardon Mr. P., it depended on something more; viz: On the willingness of that Son, to be given and sacrificed to that end —on the steadfastness with which he bowed to the Father's will in the matter when the season of sacrifices arrived—and on the fi-

delity and self-devotion with which he gave himself to the great undertaking, even unto the end. Now Mr. P. must admit, or deny, that Christ *could* have acted otherwise in this matter than as he did, If he admits, that Christ was a self-acting agent, and God, in fulfilling his absolute promises, *does not* do so "independently of any necessary agency of man, or *any other being*." If he denies; then he strips the Savior of free agency in the matter; he undermines his own scheme of human redemption; he denies to the Savior the merit of having done what he did from choice, rather than from necessity; and he reduces the whole matter to a mere affair of arbitrary power on the part of God. So much for Mr. Power's accuracy of information, on subjects into which he has dipt so presumptiously, and self-confidently.

One more remark on this point. In representing Jehovah as fulfilling his absolute purposes by human agency, it is not implied that violence is thereby done to their wills —that their actions are compulsory—or that God exerts a direct energy upon men. By no means. Our belief is that all shall be favored with such a revelation of his glory, and shall be brought so to comprehend the means of our own blessedness, that we all shall spontaneously love him as the perfection of all goodness, and yield him our hearty homage as the surest means of our

own best felicity; thus each will, in submitting to the will of God, shall be but yielding a consent to be brought into harmony with its own happiness forever.

A SLUR AT UNIVERSALISM RETORTED.—"In the case of the Ninevites, the declaration, that in forty days Ninevah should be destroyed, and their faith therein, and consequent repentance, kept them out of heaven for many years; for if they had not believed and reformed, they would all have been perfectly safe and happy in heaven, within the precise forty days specified in the declaration.

It is true, however, that in the case of the Israelites, whose 'carcasses were wasted in the wilderness,' the result was widely different. For, unlike the Ninevites, whose obedience kept them out of heaven for many years, the Israelites, by their murmuring, rebellious, stubborn unbelief of God's promises, provoked the Divine judgments upon themselves, and were taken directly to heaven; except the minors, who could not disbelieave or rebel, and Caleb and Joshua, who believed the promises and were faithful and obedient, and were kept out of heaven thereby for many years! Such are the absurdities of the system."

If it is so very desirable to be cut off from human life, and be "taken to heaven," perhaps some of Mr. P.'s readers would like him to explain, *why* God considered it a

punishment in relation to Moses and Aaron? Both these servants of God were thus treated, *expressly for their disobedience!* Perhaps, too, he could tell them why good King Hezekiah was kept fifteen years out of heaven, *in answer to his own earnest prayer!*—Also, why all the old patriarchs considered themselves blessed in having granted unto them a long life on earth, when thereby their arrival in heaven must necessarily have been delayed! It might, furthermore, be gratifying to have his wisdom inform them, why Lazerus was recalled to earth—subject to the fearful liabilities of a second probation—after having once attained to actual possession of heavenly bliss! And pray Mr. P., when you have tried your teeth on these nuts, and ascertained that with all the aid of your miserable theology you cannot crack them, will you try to have sense and modesty enough in future to refrain from throwing stones at other people's houses, regardless of the frail and brittle character of your own? Your friends, I think, will feel relieved from much apprehension, both on their own occount and yours, if you will.

To the uninformed reader I will say, that Mr. P.'s slur affects not Universalism at all, for it assumes as the Universalist belief, that sinners pass immediately from this life to heaven; whereas, in relation to their *immediate* after-death condition, we assume no

position whatever. *In the resurrection*, we say, all will be made alive in Christ, &c., but farther—as the Bible teacheth nought distinctly—so teach we. But Mr. P. holds, that all good men go immediately to heaven at death; it therefore concerns him to answer the above questions. Moses and Aaron were good men; yet God cut off their mortal lives as a punishment for certain specified acts of disobedience. It concerns Mr. P. to say, whether the taking them directly to heaven *was* a punishment? Hezekiah was a good man; at his earnest desire God granted him the blessing of a protracted stay on earth. It becomes Mr. P. to tell us, if the being kept fifteen years out of heaven *was* a blessing?—especially, when connected (according to his doctrine) with the liability of losing his soul in the time, and going to an endless hell at last! Yet the man in whose creed these, and other like giant difficulties arise, affects to make himself merry with some fancied difficulties in the creed of others! I pass now to consider Mr. P.'s evasions of the absolute promises of God as affecting Universalism.

On these he lays much stress, and insists with much enlargement, although they are not a matter to be proud of, God knows, even were they not borrowed, as they are, from the oracle of his sect, Dr. Adam Clarke. The sum of these evasions is, that God's promises may be broken!—nay worse

—God's predictions, as to matters of fact, may be falsified by the events themselves! All is fair, you see, reader, in polemics, as well as in war. Let us see, then, how well he gets along in disposing of these promises.

His first *promise* is a *threatening!* "Yet forty days, and Ninevah shall be overthrown." His next *promise* is an *answer to a question of fact!* "Will Saul come down to Keilah?" "Will the men of Keilah deliver me up into his hands?" To both of these inquiries the answers were affirmative; yet they were not verified, for David by reason of them, avoided going to Keilah, and this changed Saul's purpose of following him thither. Now, in reason's name, must not the cause be desperately pressed that betakes itself to such aids? As to the case of Ninevah, the conditionality of the menace is clearly implied in the fact, that God sent Jonah thither on purpose to avert the calamity threatened. Whereas, in the case of his promise to bless all of our race in Christ, he sent Christ to *fulfil*—not to *avert* it. A striking difference marks the different cases, then, the reader will perceive.

Mr. Power's next two instances are more in point. The first is, God's message to Eli, on account of the wickedness of his sons. "I said, indeed, that thy house, and the house of thy father should walk before

me forever; but now the Lord saith, be it far from me; for them that honor me I will honor, and they that despise me shall be lightly esteemed." The second is God's language to the multitude who left Egypt. "Doubtless, you shall not come into the land, concerning which I sware to make you dwell therein. Save Caleb, the son of Zephenniah, and Joshua, the son of Nun. But your little ones, which you said should be a prey; them will I bring in, and they shall know the land which ye have despised, &c.

"From these testimonies," reasoneth Mr. P. in his usual strain of mildness and modesty, "there is no alternative for Universalism, but to charge the Almighty with falsehood, or admit the conditionality of the promise and oath of God. The former would be blasphemy in a high degree; the latter would be totally ruinous to their system." Pages 79, 80. Yea, if "their system" assumed that *all* the divine promises are unconditional. But does it so? He himself knows that it does not; he farther knows that the cases he adduces do not at all bear upon the issue between Universalists and others, touching the divine promises; he himself, on his next page, makes Universalism to teach, "that the conditional promises (if there are such) include temporal blessings, and a partial salvation to some portion of the human family in this life."

Nor need he have thrown in the parenthetical clause ("if there are such") for he right well knows that we distinctly teach that "there are such." To what purpose, then, is all this part of his labor, save to darken counsel by words without knowledge? Or worse, to impose upon the credulity of his readers the false impression, that Universalism rejects, altogether, the notion of the conditionality of God's promises, whether they regard the present life or the life to come.

THE SPECIAL, IN DISTINCTION FROM, THE COMMON SALVATION.—Mr. P. over and over again asserts that the common salvation—i. e., the salvation implied in the expressions, "who is the Savior of men"—"the Christ, the Savior of the world"—"who taketh away the sin of the world," &c. is to be understood as meaning, merely, that all were intended to be benefited by Christ's death—that thereby salvation was made *possible* to all, &c. He even tries, by his very peculiar logic—which, for the benefit of all foggy reasoners, ought to be patented—to make out a serious dilemma for those who reject this position. Here is the process—note it well—whether such logic leads to Methodism, or Methodism to it, I am somewhat puzzled to decide; in all probability, however, they lead to each other—pages 84, and 85.

"For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." John iii. 16.

"On this we remark, 1. God had absolutely promised to give his Son to redeem the world. 2. Christ has come into the world, bore our sins in his own body on the tree, tasted death for every man. 3. In this, the absolute Divine promises have been fulfilled, or have they not? If they have not, then Christ must have died for the sins of the world, either without one absolute Divine promise to that effect, or he has died contrary to the promises of God; either of which would not only be absurd, but a presumptuous contradiction of all the promises of God on that subject. It follows, therefore, conclusively, that God, in so loving the world as to give his Son to die for man, has graciously fulfilled the absolute promises to Abraham; and so far is that fulfillment from unconditionally saving all men in heaven, that while it procures a possible salvation for all, and offers eternal life to him that believeth, it proclaims that the unbeliever shall perish; which is, most unquestionably the opposite of everlasting life."

You may require some help, reader, to understand the above, or to have any sort of comprehension as to what the man is "driving at." You must know, then, that he labors might and main through many tedious and foggy pages, to make out that God's promise to Abraham, as well as his own absolute promises of blessing to mankind, amounted to no more than that Christ should die to make their salvation *possible*. So his logic in the above amounts to this—look for yourself, and see if it does not.—

If *all* the absolute promises of God were not fulfilled in Christ's death, then he must have died without *one* absolute promise to that effect! Or even *contrary to* the promises of God! Was ever a wilder conclusion arrived at by a man in a strait jacket? If God's promise to Abraham is silent as to Christ's death, then the whole Bible is silent! Or, worse still, the whole Bible is opposed to it! To the less *logical* reader, methinks, it will seem clear enough, after all, that Christ's death *might* be predicted in the 53rd of Isaiah, even if it is not in God's promise to Abraham. But note farther.—"It follows, therefore, conclusively," saith he,—it does of course, or Mr. P. would'nt say so—"that God, in so loving the world as to give his Son to die for man, has graciously fulfilled the absolute promises to Abraham." Of course, then, God's "absolute promises to Abraham," were, "I will give my Son to die for man." *Were* they so? Or were they rather, "In thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed?" The reader may decide the true version for himself. But the "it follows therefore, conclusively," in the above process, is a sequence that would make Watts, Lowth, Jamieson, and other masters of logic stare, methinks.

Mr. P. is bound to do *something* with the passages which represent God as "the Savior of all men," and Christ as "the Savior

of the world;" and therefore does he labor most lustily to show that it is in *this* world all men are saved—not in another. But then arises a troublesome question.—What are all men saved *from* in this world? Not from sin—for all are sinners. Not from suffering—for all are sufferers. Not from death—for all die. Not from error—for all do err. From *what*, then? Why, assumes Mr. P., from God's wrath, on account of what was done by Adam and Eve. Most thankfully ought we to receive this information from our brother termed "Orthodox," and *self*-termed "Evangelical," for who but they can gather anything of the sort from the Bible?

Let common sense decide whether, in the Universalist view of these subjects, there is not infinitely more appreciable ground of gratitulation, and thankfulness to God.—God's promises, that the woman's seed should bruize the serpent's head, and that in Abraham's seed all nations, families, and kindreds of man shall be blessed, we say imply, that sin shall eventually be brought to a period by the instrumentality of the Savior—that, consequently, moral death, and misery, which result from sin, will cease with their cause—that universal humanity, now enthralled thereby, shall be emancipated—be made righteous—be reconciled to their Creator, whom they shall now behold in the cloudless light of truth,

and thus beholding shall love by a necessary law of their being. Thus shall God prove, as the origin of these blessings, and Christ, as the instrument of the Father, "the Savior of all men"—"the Savior of the world."

These promises we say, are the very gospel which we are called upon to believe, and on the belief of which our *present* salvation and blessedness depend. Believing this, we "enter into rest;" we are "justified by faith," and "have peace with God;" we "rejoice with joy that is unspeakable, and full of glory;" we recognize God as "the Savior of all men," and, so recognizing him, we have an experimental verification of the fact, that he is the Savior "especially of them that believe." This we term the *special*, in distinction from the *common* salvation. In respect to this, "he that believeth not is damned already,"—is an alien from the commonwealth of Israel, and a stranger to the covenant of promise; without God, and without hope in the world." Still, God, "who is the Savior of all men," is necessarily his Savior also; but as he is *not* so in a *present*, he must be so in a *prospective* sense, otherwise he would not be so termed; for the all-gracious Jehovah mocks not man with language implying relations that do not subsist.

In what Sense was Man lost? "The system may attempt," says Mr. P., "to avoid

the force of these conclusions, [the reader will have seen what *force* they have,] by denying that man was ever lost." That is, we may deny, in our blindness, that we had any concern in the apple-eating offence of Adam and Eve, and, consequently, as we deserved no damnation therefor, we were exposed to none, and had none to be saved from. Well, we do, in truth, take this position. Nevertheless, we admit that we are lost, in what we regard to be the scriptural sense of that term. We are lost to present holiness—to a present appreciation of God's love—to an enjoyment of communion and fellowship with his blessed spirit. We are in darkness, ignorance, corruption, and moral death. Such being our estate, in infinite compassion to us, "the Father sent the Son to be the Savior of the world"—"to seek and to save that which is lost"—and to "reconcile the world unto himself." Nevertheless, to God's all-foreseeing and changeless love, we were never lost—never, to the world-wide embrace of his restoring purpose; impossible, for "according to his purpose and grace, given us in Christ Jesus *before the world began*," our salvation was inerasably enrolled among the events to be. On no other supposition is it possible that Infinite Love could have contemplated his finished works in the morning of creation, and pronounced all "very good."

Mr. Power's Inconsistencies. Heaven

knows what a dish of these could be served up, if it were worth the trouble. On page 91, on the text in Col. i. 19, which speaks of God's purpose of reconciling all things to himself by Jesus Christ, he says: "it is direct proof that God was justly *unreconciled to man*, for his apostacy," &c! That is, the sending Christ to reconcile man to God, is direct proof that God himself was unreconciled! The reader, from this specimen, may learn the value of Mr. P.'s *direct* proofs; if they speak the opposite of what he would prove by them, they are *direct proofs* in its favor! But this is not all, for notwithstanding that God was unreconciled, and Christ removed that unreconciliation, yet, "let it be strictly observed," says Mr. P., page 92, "that what Christ has done in the work of redemption, has wrought *no change* in the Divine mind, or the principles of his moral government, but is an additional proof of the unchangeability of both." This, then, is another of his *direct proofs:* the reconciling of a justly unreconciled God, is a proof of the Divine unchangeability! Of this same unchangeable God, Watts says,

> "Rich were the drops of Jesus' blood,
> That smothed his frowning face,
> That sprinkled o'er the burning throne,
> And turned the wrath to grace."

All this, however, implies no change in God; by no means; it is rather "in direct proof" that God cannot change!

Again Mr. P. says, and in several instances repeats the sentiment, substantially, that "every child of Adam is born into the world in a state of justification and favor with God," page 93. Yet his creed is, that we are born into the world in a state of *total depravity;* a rejection of that tenet is one of the heresies with which (and justly) he accuses Universalism; one of the hymns of his church reads,

> "Lord, we are vile, conceived in sin,
> And born unholy and unclean,
> Sprung from the man whose guilty fall
> Corrupts his race, and taints us all.
>
> Soon as we draw our infant breath,
> The seeds of sin grow up for death;
> Thy law demands a perfect heart,
> But we're defiled in every part."

Yet these vile, young reprobates are "in a state of justification and favor with God"! Really, God regards total depravity with more favor than many good people have thought.

Once more; speaking of the indispensability of the shedding of blood for man's redemption, he says, page 92, "There was no other being in the universe who could accomplish this work for man, except He in whom it pleased the Father all fullness should dwell; who in the beginning was with God, and in unoriginated nature and perfections was God." Were ever grouped together more incongruities in as few words?

Let us analyze this *morceau*. 1st. All fullness dwelt in Christ because it so pleased the Father. 2d. Notwithstanding this, he was *unoriginated* in his nature and perfections—in other words, possessed his fullness independently of the Father. 3d. He *was* the Father himself—else (as he was God) there is a God besides the Father. And 4th. This unoriginated God was the only being in the universe who could shed his blood to the satisfaction of his own law, or to the pacification of his own wrath! Really! when Universalism learns to mystify at this rate, we may well believe that the unriddling of her mazy mysteries will deserve to be paid with a whole eternity of heavenly bliss.

CHAPTER V.

Many of the threatenings and conditional promises considered, together with opposing arguments and criticisms. Is salvation in heaven conditional?

MANY OF THE THREATENINGS &c., CONSIDERED. Very much of the language of Scripture which our opponents assume to be applicable to the future life, we think has little or no reference thereto. Yet it must not be hence concluded—as by our opponents it too commonly is—that we confine the application of *all* the divine promises to the present existence. We do no such thing; and when we discriminate between those which are, and those which are not thus confinable, it is not arbitrarily, as we think, but on good and warrantable ground.

Mr. Power, on pages 98 and 99, presents a list of texts which he charges us with thus applying, in a tone as if the fact implied some violent sin against the sanctity of the Bible, and the laws of just criticism. He even affects to think that we ourselves would be frightened at the extent of our guilt in this particular, if we but knew as well as he, how far we carried it! Modest, is he not? "That this extraordinary feature of Universalism will surprise many,"

saith he, "and even some of its own votaries who are but partially acquainted with its peculiarities, is highly probable; but that it is a fair and impartial statement of the case is susceptible of the clearest demonstration." Is it so, indeed, Mr. P? Well, we will save you the labor of making the case out, and will at once enter a plea of *guilty, with justification.*

We will take, now, his several texts, and see whether, without any marked outrage upon common sense, or the admitted principles of correct interpretation, they may not be understood as applying exclusively to this life.

"He that believeth shall be saved—He that believeth not shall be damned." Mark xvi. 16. Mr. P. believes—is *he* saved? If yea, then his experience verifies the applicability of the text to the present existence. If nay, then he either is still in unbelief, or believers, as well as unbelievers, are damned! On the other hand, he once believed not—was *he*, then, in a state of damnation? If yea, then the verity of the text is expeperienced in this life. If nay, then, either there is a condition between salvation and damnation, or, not being damned, he was saved, while yet in unbelief! Now, while the Scriptures set forth that, "He that believeth on the Son *hath* everlasting life;" they also affirm that, "He that believeth not *is* condemned [or damned] already."

Which, surely, looks very much like an application of its promises and threatenings to the present life, by the Bible itself. But furthermore, Mr. P. must apply *all* of his texts to the future existence, if *any*; he does not believe that the being *baptized* here is essential to the being saved hereafter. Yet his text says, not only that "he that believeth," but also, that "he that believeth *and is baptized*, shall be saved." Why did Mr. P. leave that clause out of the quotation, except that he felt that it militated against his application of the whole?

"He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life, but he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him." John iii. 36. Mr. P. will admit that, while he believed not the Son, the wrath of God abode on him. Does it abide on him still? If yea, then, either he still believeth not the Son, or the wrath of God abideth on *believers*, also. If nay, then, by his own experience it is proved, that both the promise and the threat in that passage may be verified in the present existence.

Passing several, on which he himself lays little stress, we come to the following. "For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness." Rom. i. 18. If this text affirmed that the wrath of God is *not* thus revealed, but that it *shall be*, in hell, here-

after, it would seem to be somewhat to Mr. P.'s purpose; as it is, however, it seems to squint strongly in quite an opposite direction.

In the text following, although no real difficulty presents itself to the enlightened Universalist, yet candor requires the admission that, to an acceptance of certain terms and phrases in an arbitrary sense, there seems more to favor that doctrine than in almost any other text in the Bible. "But after thy hardness and impenitent heart treasurest up unto thyself wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God; who will render to every man according to his deeds: to them who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory and honor and immortality, eternal life: but unto them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that doeth evil, of the Jew first, and also of the Gentile." Rom. ii. 5–9.

Let us examine this passage with particular care, and as little prejudice, as possible. 1st. "The day of wrath, and revelation of the righteous judgment of God." This, I know, is assumed to mean a day of general judgment at the close of time. To test the truth of this assumption we will scrutinize several of the strongest-seeming texts in the Bible, in which similar language is

employed. "The great day of the Lord is near, it is near, and hasteneth greatly, even the voice of the day of the Lord: the mighty man shall cry there bitterly. That day is a day of wrath, a day of trouble and distress, a day of wasteness and desolation, a day of darkness and gloominess, a day of clouds and thick darkness, a day of the trumpet and alarm against the fenced cities, and against the high towers. And I will bring distress upon men, that they shall walk like blind men, because they have sinned against the Lord: and their blood shall be poured out as dust, and their flesh as the dung. Neither their silver nor their gold shall be able to deliver them in the day of the Lord's wrath: but the whole land shall be devoured by the fire of his jealousy: for he shall make even a speedy riddance of all them that dwell in the land." Zeph. i. 14—18. If this refers to the future life, what are those "fenced cities," and "high towers," that are menaced in the denunciation? Shall men in a future life "walk like blind men?" Shall "their blood," in a future life, "be poured out as the dust, and their flesh as dung?" This is quite enough to be said on this text, methinks.

"Behold, the day of the Lord cometh, cruel both with wrath and fierce anger, to lay the land desolate: and he shall destroy the sinners thereof out of it. For the stars

of heaven and the constellations thereof shall not give their light: the sun shall be darkened in his going forth, and the moon shall not cause her light to shine. And I will punish the world for their evil, and the wicked for their iniquity; and I will cause the arrogancy of the proud to cease, and will lay low the haughtiness of the terrible. I will make a man more precious than fine gold; even a man than the golden wedge of Ophir. Therefore I will shake the heavens, and the earth shall remove out of her place, in the wrath of the Lord of hosts, and in the day of his fierce anger. And it shall be as the chased roe, and as a sheep that no man taketh up: they shall every man turn to his own people, and flee every one into his own land. Every one that is found shall be thrust through; and every one that is joined unto them shall fall by the sword. Their children also shall be dashed to pieces before their eyes; their houses shall be spoiled, and their wives ravished. Behold, I will stir up the Medes against them, which shall not regard silver; and as for gold, they shall not delight in it. Their bows also shall dash the young men to pieces; and they shall have no pity on the fruit of the womb; their eye shall not spare children. And Babylon, the glory of kingdoms, the beauty of the Chaldees' excellency, shall be as when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah." Isa. xiii. 9–19.

I should deem it an insult to the good sense of my reader—whatever his faith—if I should use argument with him to prove that here a temporal judgment only is meant, although much pomp and hyperbole of description are employed. In the same prophet, chap. xxxiv., the language and imagery are still more bold and terrific; yet it belongs wholly to the overthrow of Idumea.

Turn we next to Revelations vi. 21–17. "And I beheld when he had opened the sixth seal, and lo, there was a great earthquake; and the sun became black as sackcloth of hair, and the moon became as blood; and the stars of heaven fell unto the earth, even as a fig tree casteth her untimely figs, when she is shaken of a mighty wind. And the heaven departed as a scroll when it is rolled together; and every mountain and island were moved out of their places. And the kings of the earth, and the great men, and the rich men, and the chief captains, and the mighty men, and every bondman, and every free man, hid themselves in the dens and in the rocks of the mountains; and said to the mountains and rocks, Fall on us, and hide us from the face of him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb: for the great day of his wrath is come; and who shall be able to stand?"

To construe this literally would be to reduce it to infinite absurdity. One star would

cover a thousand worlds like ours; consequently, the stars could not literally fall from heaven to the earth. Moreover, if this passage is referred to what is commonly termed "the last day," then to that period will continue the distinctions of "great men"—"chief captains"—"bondmen"—"free men"—(or manumitted slaves,) &c., which is in direct contradiction of prophecy as to future events on earth under Messiah's reign. Swords are to be beaten into plough-shares and spears into pruning hooks—nations are to learn war no more, consequently, will want no "chief captains," or other military dignitaries—Christ's kingdom shall overcome and subdue all other kingdoms; the stone cut out of the mountain shall fill the whole earth, &c. Do our opponents believe these foretellings of sacred prophecy? If so, how *can* they, at the same time believe that at the last day those distinctions will exist which imply a vicious and semi-barbarous state of society? Truth is, they seem, in reference to these matters, to know not what they really do believe. As to the particular passage under notice, however, some of the highest among even Orthodox authorities agree that it refers exclusively to things of time. Dr. Clarke seems in doubt whether to apply it to events connected with the destruction of Jerusalem, or to the signal changes under Constantine the Great.

So much, then, as to the "day of wrath, and revelation of the righteous judgment of God." Whenever a signal retribution overtakes an individual, or a community, *that* is a day of wrath to that individual or people: it is a revelation of God's righteous judgment.

"Who will render to every man according to his deeds." When? In the future life? No; even Mr. P. shall be forced to concede this. Does *he* expect to be recompensed in eternity according to his deeds? Not he; but rather, according to the state in which he shall die. His expectation is that however he may act through his previous life, if he dies a christian he shall be rewarded for his good deeds only, while of his evil actions no account will be taken.—But, on this ground, we have a reckoning in reserve for him.

"To them who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory, honor, and immortality; eternal life." What advocate of endless misery is willing to abide a strict application of this language to a future world? He may indeed admit that "glory" may be attained by "patient continuance in well doing; and "honor" also; but does he hold that "immortality" can be only thus attained? If so, then without such continuance in well doing annihilation will ensue. What then would become of endless misery? In order to attain *it* immortality is an indispensable prerequisite.

The scriptural meaning of the phrase "eternal life," we will subject to a separate consideration by and by. Suffice it that we say here, *it is possessed by the believer in the present world.* "He that believeth on the Son HATH everlasting life;" he "*is passed* from death unto life."

"Indignation and anguish upon every soul of man that doeth evil." That is, upon every *individual* of man; for the word soul, in a large majority of instances in the Scriptures — as often in common discourse— means the person, or individual. "Eight souls were saved from drowning; "That soul shall be cut off from among his people," &c. That such is its meaning here, is obvious from the sentence following— "Of the Jew first, and also of the Gentile." For who supposes that the distinctions of Jew and Gentile will exist in the future life?

In brief, then, I would explain the text thus: Those who, through faith in Christ, cultivate their moral powers—aspire after glory, honor, and immortality, rather than devote their attention to the gratification of their sensual appetites, shall enjoy the divine life resulting from that course—their confidence in God will be strong, and their hope in his mercy unclouded—theirs shall be the communion with God which constitutes the soul's true life;—while those who disregard the Gospel, and live in violation of its holy precepts, shall experience the moral dark-

ness, degradation, and death thence ensuing.

To the same effect—and surely without any violent strain of the just laws of interpretation—may be explained every text which Mr. P. adduces as bearing upon the future life. "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth," &c, "but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven," is but another version of the precept, "Set your affections on things above, and not on things that are beneath." For (according to its literal construction) by whom is the former of these precepts practically heeded? Does Mr. P. himself forego the acquisition of worldly wealth, when opportunities to that effect present themselves? Can he select many of his Christian brethren who do? Well-a-day! If the refraining from laying up earthly wealth is the price at which heaven is to be attained, how few seem disposed to procure admission there on such terms!

To the same effect, also, is the precept, "Labor not for the meat which perisheth, but for that which endureth to everlasting life." The Universalist, as well as Mr. P., "inculcates this sentiment—with the difference, that the former does so with reference to *this* existence; he would have those virtues and affections *here* cultivated, which will *here* consist with the soul's true life, and, therefore, will prove enduring. While

Mr. P. would have people labor for something which shall not particularly benefit them here, but which may—if they chance to die right—benefit them hereafter. All according to him, depends on how people die —nothing on how they may have lived.

OPPOSING ARGUMENTS AND CRITICISMS CONSIDERED, RELATIVE TO THE PHRASES ETERNAL LIFE, AND EVERLASTING LIFE.—Mr. P., as a logician, has a talent for reasoning himself into an intellectual quagmire, but none for reasoning himself out again; his reasoning faculty is obviously diseased—it is developed to excess—there is a want of balance between it and his other intellectual organs. I know not otherwise how to account for the perpetual laboring after logical dilemmas, with which his book abounds; for in those supposed dilemmas nothing more obviously appears to the clear-sighted reader, than that the author himself is in a mental fog, so dense as to blind his vision to the legitimate sequence of his argument. This disease of his reasoning faculty moreover, leads him to labor the proof of positions admitted, with as much zeal as of positions denied. Nay, he even labors the proof of positions which are self-evident—mere truisms—as, for instance, that moral life is the opposite of moral death! and that "if natural life is not the opposite of natural death, men may be naturally dead and alive at the same time!" page 103. This

is, if we may borrow a vulgar saying, logic gone to seed. If he deemed that his readers would be enlightened by it, they owe him no particular thanks for the compliment to their understandings, I opine.

Of this *reasoning run mad*, the opponent would have no right to complain, however, were it not that with these mere truisms are mixed up propositions of a questionable kind, and conclusions drawn from the whole as if they belonged to one category. For instance, in immediate connexion with the above, he adds: "If everlasting life, or eternal life, does not imply the endless continuance in heaven of the spiritual life of holiness and love, men may be the subjects of eternal life, and yet be wholly destitute of such *endless* spiritual life, and of course the subjects of spiritual moral death." Now this is hard to refute, simply because it is hard to understand. By a close scrutiny of it the following is perceived to be its purport. If *eternal* life, is not the same as *endless* life, then men may possess the one, without possessing the other. Well, who doubts that? This, again, is a mere truism. But mark, how he jumbles in the one conclusion, the self-evident with the doubtful; he adds, "and, of course, be the subjects of spiritual moral death." That is, if *eternal* life does not imply an *endless* life, then a man may have eternal life, and be at the same time a subject of moral death! In the

name of all the books on logic that ever were written, what sort of a sequence is here? It were the same as to argue that, if good health do not imply an endless continuance of health, then a man may be in good health and yet be, at the same time, the subject of a fatal disease! The blunder in this case would consist in making a fatal disease the oppositie (not of good health, which it is, but) of *an endless continuance* of good health. This, in principle, is precisely Mr. P.'s blunder; he makes spiritual death the opposite of *endless* spiritual life; and of such loose contexture is nearly all the logic throughout his book.

I have before shown that *eternal* is not equivalent to *endless*, in its application to that state of the soul which is the result of faith and obedience. This I can compel Mr. P. himself to concede. A man may today be a believing disciple of Christ; as such he "hath everlasting life"—and according to Mr. P. he hath an *endless* life. Well; to-morrow he falls from his believing estate. Where, now, is his endless life? Mr. P. must admit that it has come to an end—but does an *endless* life come to an end? Now, that the *quality* of a life of faith—not its *duration*—is implied in its being called eternal, is evident; for as the unbeliever is to live endlessly as well as the believer, the proposition—if eternal in that connexion meant endless—would be equally

true of the former as of the latter, that, he hath eternal life. Nay, even of the Devil himself it would hold true; for he also hath eternal life, in the *endless* sense of that phrase.

That the life termed everlasting, and eternal, is the same *in nature* with that we shall enjoy in heaven, is freely admitted, and also that it will there be of endless continuance. But it will not do to argue hence, (as Mr. P. does) that the phrase *necessarily* suggests the idea of endless continuance, any more than it will to argue that, because the holiness we may here enjoy is the same in nature as that which we shall enjoy in heaven, therefore, the term holiness necessarily suggests the idea of endless continuance—as it regards God, and angels, and heaven, it does so, undoubtedly—but not as it regards man, and things mundane.

On the whole, then, the phrases eternal life, and everlasting life, in their scriptural applications, mean the life of faith here enjoyed by the Christian; so Jesus himself defines it. "This is life eternal, that men may know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." John xvii. 2. This divine knowledge constitutes the soul's essential life—and he who possesses this, "*is passed* from death unto life."

In the light of this exposition we are prepared for the following text, and Mr. P.'s comment thereon.

"But now, being made free from sin, and become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life," Romans vi. 22. Language cannot be plainer than this is, in support of the doctrine, that the blessing of everlasting life extends into the future and endless world. 1. Those contemplated by the apostle are made free from sin; the highest degree of salvation in this life. 2. Have become servants to God; which implies, in this case, all practical godliness. 3. As a blessed consequence, they have their fruit unto holiness; that is, all their tempers of mind, and actions of life, are consistent with Gospel holiness; but, 4. So far is all this from being full salvation, that they wait in joyful hope for the end—everlasting life.—It is, therefore, clear beyond all successful contradiction, that the apostle believed and taught, that the full enjoyment of the promised blessing of everlasting life, belongs alone to the future world."—Pp. 107.

Is this clear beyond successful contradiction? Let us see. The apostle is contrasting the past experience with the present of those whom he addresses. "For when," says he, "ye were the servants of sin, ye were free from righteousness. What fruit," he asks, "had you in those things whereof ye are now ashamed? For the end of those things is death. But now," he adds, "being made free from sin," &c., "ye have your fruit into holiness, and the end [not, "*ye wait in joyful hope* for the end," as Mr. P. exposits it, and on which assumption he builds his conclusion; but, by an obvious supply of the ellipsis in the passage, the apostle tells them—"*ye have* the end"] ev-

erlasting life." "To be carnally minded is death"; while they were carnally minded they experienced this end. "But to be spiritually minded is life and peace": and to this their present experience testified—they had (for the promise never is, *shall* have, but *have*) "everlasting life." This was the end, or result, of their present conduct.

Before noticing any more of the passages of Scripture quoted by Mr. P., on the subject of conditional salvation,—that is, as he holds it, the final salvation, supposed to be suspended on conditions performed here,—let us hear what he says on pp. 101–2:

"The salvation contemplated in this language of the Bible *must be sought for by man*, and is the result of his *reformation, faith, and obedience to God*. This cannot be denied without contradicting, as the quotations given hereafter will show, the whole testimony of the Scriptures bearing on this point; as also, the experience and common sense of every man living on earth. For, who has been saved, justified from the guilt of sin, had peace with God, the witness in himself, the love of God shed abroad in his heart by the Holy Spirit given unto him, without seeking God—without obedience and faith?—Not one. And who that has thus sought the Lord by obedient faith, that has not obtained these blessings? None. And who that has refused thus to seek the Lord by faith and humble obedience, has obtained this salvation? No one of our race.

This salvation by grace, through faith, is *absolutely necessary*, IN THIS LIFE, to final salvation in heaven, *or it is not*. If Universalism admits that *it is*, it thereby concedes the whole question, and the concession must be the inevitable ruin of the whole system; *for all* who are not thus saved by *faith here*,

cannot possibly be saved hereafter in heaven. And if, to avoid these consequences, it denies that this salvation by faith is necessary, it must maintain that neither repentance, faith, holiness, love to God, or any other virtue or grace whatever, is necessary, in this life, in order to final holiness and happiness after death; and that men are no more sure of heaven with all the faith they can exercise, and all the obedience they can render to God, than they are if wholly destitute of all these moral qualities; and that God never designed the salvation of the Gospel to have any bearing on, or connection with, man's final salvation in heaven; and of course, the whole is confined exclusively to this world."

Now let us take Mr. P. at his word, and thus interpret all the passages of Scripture quoted by him. "This salvation by grace, through FAITH, is *absolutely necessary* IN THIS LIFE, to final salvation, or it is *not*."—Now whatever salvation is spoken of as *conditional*, and depending on faith, can be enjoyed by those ONLY, who have the faith, etc. It is absolutely essential; or else the passages have no meaning—if any can enjoy *that* salvation who do *not* believe, reform, etc. The question then is, *Is* the final salvation—does Mr. P. himself, or any Partialist really believe the final salvation to be—suspended on faith to be exercised *here?* I answer, No—not one! And if *not*, then no such passages of Scripture, relative to conditional salvation, can be pressed into that service; but necessarily relate to the present gospel salvation. If he *does* so believe, he must exclude from that salvation,

all INFANTS, IDIOTS, and PAGANS! for they do not and cannot believe; and are not thus saved "in this life"—said by Mr. P. to be absolutely necessary" to salvation hereafter.

According to these facts, then, must all such declarations of the Word of God be interpreted and understood. If they speak of a "salvation," or "life," or "everlasting life," etc., as *conditional*, and suspended on faith and reformation, they must necessarily relate to *this life;* or else we must believe in the exclusion from heaven of all who *can not* believe, and have no capacity or opportunity of believing! In this manner must we understand the "crown of righteousness, . . . laid up for those who *love* Christ's appearing," spoken of by Paul, in 2 Tim. iv. 6—8, and quoted by Mr. P.; and being "kept by the power of God through *faith* unto salvation," in 1 Pet. i. 3—5; and "the crown of life for those who *love* the Lord"—James i. 12; and "be thou *faithful* unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life," Rev. ii. 10. Now, if these passages relate to the final salvation, as Mr. P. affirms, then *none* can enjoy it but those who *love* Christ and his appearing, and *believe*, and are *faithful* unto death—consequently *excluding* ALL who do not or cannot believe, love, and be faithful. How much more natural, and correct, and Scriptural to understand these Sacred Writers to

speak of some peculiar blessings which *only* the Christian believer now has, and which we know Pagans, and idiots, and infants do not enjoy!—for, turn whichever way we may, none except such can enjoy the blessings here described.

But let us have another of Mr. Power's manifold and pungent syllogisms; and to the proof and illustration of which he devotes some ten or twelve tedious pages:

"To settle this point with a clearness bearing some proportion to the great interest of man involved therein, we remark, 1. In relation to our personal and final salvation, God has absolutely forbidden *our faith and obedience* as a condition thereof; or, 2. He is absolutely indifferent with regard to our faith and obedience, as a condition of our final salvation in heaven; or, 3. He does absolutely require our faith and obedience, as a condition of our final salvation in heaven; and without which it is impossible for him, consistently with his moral government and veracity, to save man in endless glory."—Pp. 109–10.

Now, to show how perfectly childish and ridiculous is all this array of forceless suppositions forming this grave syllogism, so far as the subject in hand is affected by it, let *us* form a similar syllogism: "1. In relation to the salvation of INFANTS *dying in infancy*, God has *absolutely forbidden* their *faith and obedience* as a condition thereof; or, 2. He is absolutely *indifferent* with regard to their faith and obedience, as a condition of their final salvation; or, 3. He

does absolutely *require* their faith and obedience, as a condition of their final salvation; and without which it is *impossible* for them, consistently with his moral government and veracity, to save them in endless glory!!"

Well?—and what does all that prove?—We leave it for Mr. P. to answer—to "answer" himself, "according to his own folly." It is wonderful to see how much paper, and ink, and time, and wear and tear of brains, is wasted by our logical and syllogistic friend, in proving or disproving, elaborating and illustrating matters that are not within a thousand miles of the subject in dispute.

We might here take leave of this chapter of Mr. P.'s book; but from the solemn gravity with which he introduces the above syllogism,—"To settle this point with a clearness bearing some proportion to the great interest of man involved therein!"—he and his friends might feel slighted, unless some attention were paid to his dozen pages of proof and illustration. Passing over the idea that God has "*forbidden* our faith, as a condition of final salvation," Mr. P. comes to speak of his "*indifference*" to it. Under this head, he quotes John iii. 14—16, 18—36; but most suicidally; for, 1. This passage suspends the "everlasting life" on "*believing* in the Son of God"; so that, if this "everlasting life" is the final salva-

tion, none can enjoy it but believers—thus excluding the millions who *never can* believe; and 2. The "life," the "condemnation," and the "wrath" are all spoken of as *present*, and not belonging to eternity.—Thus: "He that believeth not *is condemned* ALREADY;" "he that believeth on the Son HATH—that is, *now* hath—everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son, shall not see life;—that is, the spiritual life of the Christian;—but the wrath of God ABIDETH on him"—that is, *now* abideth on him, while an unbeliever. Does not everybody see that it is a manifest perversion of this passage, to refer it to the final destiny of the soul? To the same effect, is John v. 24, before commented on: "He that believeth on him that sent me, HATH everlasting life, . . . *is passed* from death unto life." How explicitly declared to be enjoyed *here!*—and yet our logical friend quotes it to prove that God is not "indifferent with regard to our faith and obedience in order to FINAL SALVATION"!! So also Rom. v. 1, 2: "Therefore, being justified by faith, we HAVE—*now* have—peace with God," etc. And Gal. ii. 20: "I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless, I LIVE;—that is, *now;*—yet not I, but Christ liveth in me; *and the life which I* NOW *live* in the flesh I live by the *faith* of the Son of God." And yet, strange to behold, the man of logic and syllogisms quotes these very words as teaching that the

final salvation in heaven—the future immortal life of blessedness—is suspended on faith exercised here!! In this way, by such expositions of the Word of God, does Mr. Power profess to overthrow Universalism—boasting of demolishing it, crushing it, and plucking it up by the roots! Alas! for the science of Theology and of biblical criticism, when fallen into such hands!

Mr. P. next attempts more directly to prove "that God absolutely *requires* our faith and obedience, as the *only* conditions of salvation, not only from sin in this life, but in its highest sense in heaven"; and quotes mark xvi. 15, 16: "He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved: but he that believeth not, shall be damned." This passage has already been shown to have no bearing upon the question of man's final destiny, and does not now call for any further exposition; but the following remarks of Mr. P. demand some attention:

"That this Divine commission is universal, will not be denied by any, and especially by Universalism; and that the salvation and damnation contemplated are consequent on faith and unbelief, is so clear that no proof can make it plainer. And it is no less clear that the condemnation threatened against the unbeliever, is the opposite of the salvation promised on conditions of faith to the believer; and the veracity of God would be no more violated to deny salvation to the latter, than it would be to grant salvation to the former while he continues in unbelief. It is therefore clear, that as it is impossible for God to lie, he is as much bound by his truth

to inflict the punishment implied in the damnation of the unbeliever, whatever it may be, as he is to save the believer, whatever that salvation may imply. To deny this would be a contradiction of Divine truth, as it falls from the lips of the Son of God." Pp. 113.

To all this we fully subscribe. "That the salvation and damnation contemplated are consequent on faith and unbelief," there can be no doubt; and consequently, if that salvation is the immortal salvation, none but believers can enjoy it, and all infants, idiots, and pagans are excluded from it! If you say, *No*, then "the salvation here contemplated" is not that final salvation; for to the enjoyment of the salvation of the text, BELIEF and BAPTISM are positively *essential*. But that salvation is the present "everlasting life," peace, and joy, possessed by the Christian believer, and *only* by him. Again, Mr. P. well says, "The condemnation [damnation] threatened against the unbeliever, is the *opposite* of the salvation promised to the believer." True; and as the salvation is enjoyed *here*, so is the damnation or condemnation endured here; and hence we read, "The life I NOW live I live by *faith;*" and again, "he that *believeth not* is condemned ALREADY." Mr. P. then speaks of "granting salvation to the unbeliever while he *continues* in unbelief." Who imagines that God does this? Certainly not Universalists; for they teach, always and everywhere, that so long as a man "continues in

unbelief," he is damned or condemned; and let it once be proved that men will "continue in unbelief" to all eternity, and we will admit the doctrine of endless damnation. But does our logical friend prove this? No—nor can he. He does not seem even to attempt it. Paul says, (Rom. xi. 32,) "For God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that he might have MERCY UPON ALL."

Take another sentence from the above extract: "God is as much *bound* by his truth to inflict the punishment implied in the damnation of the unbeliever, whatever it may be, as he is to save the believer."—Agreed. Now *what is* that damnation? Endless misery? Well, will it be inflicted on all unbelievers, as God threatens? *No*, Mr. P. will answer; for if they become believers, they *escape* this damnation. What then is God's *truth*, according to our boasting logician's mode of reasoning? But it is said that the Savior means, "He that *dies* a believer, shall be saved; and he that *dies* an unbeliever, shall be damned." It is a sufficient answer, that Jesus did *not say so;* nor did he *mean so*. This notion about our final destiny being suspended on the state of the soul at the *moment of death*, regardless of character, works, or anything in this *life*, is the prime *assumption* of modern Orthodoxy, and has no foundation or countenance in Scripture.

Mr. P. then proceeds to re-quote several

passages, already noticed. One is 2 Tim. iv. 6—8; where Paul speaks of the "crown of righteousness," to be given to him and to all that loved the appearing of the Lord.—We can not withhold from our readers Mr. P.'s elegant paraphrase of the passage, "on the supposition that Paul was a Universalist." It is given as a specimen of the author's fairness of representation, of his Christian spirit, and of his logical acumen:

"I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand; but I am no better prepared for, and am no more sure of heaven and glory than than I was when a bold persecutor of Jesus Christ and his holy and harmless followers—than when I was dragging men, women and children to martyrdom and death. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course; but in all this I have not promoted my own, nor the salvation in heaven of an individual of our whole race; and my own and their final salvation would have been just as sure, if I had continued to oppose Christ and his children till the present hour. I have kept the faith; but had I denied the faith, and lived in consummate infidelity; and had I exterminated not only the faith of Jesus Christ, but of the existence of God from the whole earth, and established the universal reign of atheism, myself and all mankind would have been, and would now be, as unconditionally sure of final holiness and happiness in heaven, as if now literally and eternally saved. Again: a crown of righteousness, which the judge will give me, and all them that love his appearing; and not them only, but to all that hate his appearing—to every class of sinners, though they live and die in the deepest depravity and crime. And they are as infallibly sure of this crown of righteousness

as if it now adorned their heads before the throne of God." Pp. 116,-17.

Now what does all that amount to, in the way of argument? Suppose Paul had been as morally corrupt as here described—an atheist, a blasphemer, a rebel against God, living in the deepest depravity, and guilty of all the sins in the dark vocabulary of crime, *up to the hour when he wrote those words*, and then been converted, say an hour before death—*what then?* I appeal to Mr. P. and every Partialist—WHAT THEN? Why, he would have been *saved!* Suppose again, that, after fighting the good fight, and keeping the faith, etc., *up to that hour*, Paul had committed a single sin, *and died so*, suddenly—*what then?* According to Mr. P.'s theology, he would have been damned, with atheists, and rebels, and blasphemers, and all the abominable in Hell! Consequently, all this beautiful paraphrase is merest STUFF—pointless, forceless, senseless declamation, indulged in for the amiable purpose of exciting and feeding an unholy prejudice against our sublime and heavenly Faith! Let us hear Mr. P. once more, on the same subject, in one of the closing paragraphs of this chapter:

"We will, before dismissing this point, adduce the testimony of the apostle John, in support of a conditional, personal salvation in heaven, by faith, obedience, and holiness in this life. "Beloved, now we are the sons of God; and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he

shall appear, we shall be like him ; for we shall see him as he is," 1 John iii. 2. And Jesus says, "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcome, and am set down with my Father in his throne. He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the Churches," Rev. iii. 21, 22. Here also, is direct reference to the heavenly glory promised to them that overcome: and that this promise is not made to the finally impenitent, and how those to whom it is made are to overcome and obtain the blessing, is settled by authority equally unexceptionable.—"For whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world ; and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith," John v, 4."

As to the passage first quoted, not a word of *conditionality* is expressed in it, even granting it to relate to man's final salvation —no allusion to the exclusion of any. As to Rev. iii. 21, 22, and 1 John v. 4,—"*overcoming* by *faith*, and sitting down on the Savior's throne,"—the remarks already made may be reiterated : if this sitting down with Christ on his throne, is the final salvation, and depends on "overcoming the world by faith," then ALL who do not thus believe and "overcome," will inevitably and necessarily be excluded from it—leading us to the fatal consequencess already alluded to. But moreover, and finally, If this passage in Rev. iii. *does* relate to eternity and man's final destiny, we will prove final UNIVERSAL salvation and blessedness beyond the shadow of a doubt. Now listen to one or two verses in the 5th chapter of Rev.: "And

EVERY CREATURE which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever. And the four beasts said, Amen. And the four and twenty elders fell down and worshipped him that liveth for ever and ever." Now we leave it to Mr. P. and his brethren to *admit* or *deny* that this part of the Book of Rev. relates to man's destiny in the immortal state. If it is *admitted*, final UNIVERSAL SALVATION is incontestibly proved; and all Mr. P.'s toil and labor of logic, and declamation, and bombast, is an utter waste of time and breath! If it is *denied* that this portion of Rev. relates to eternity, then it is demonstrated that the passage quoted by Mr. P., Rev. iii, has no bearing upon the question in hand, and its use for that purpose, a manifest perversion of it! This dilemma has two horns: Mr. P. may take his choice!

Mr. Power's chapter on "conditional salvation" has passed in review before us; and we see how far short he comes of proving that the *ultimate* salvation—immortal blessedness is conditional. The whole matter may be summed up thus: The final salvation may be enjoyed by all men—by all human intelligences, according to God's will, and as the free gift of his love. This

fact is made known in the Gospel, which men are required to believe and obey.—Thus believing and obeying, they enjoy spiritual life and peace—they take hold on the final salvation, as it were, bring it down and appropriate it to their present enjoyment, and "rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory," in prospect of the ultimate DELIVERANCE of the whole human" creation from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the sons of God!"—Rom. viii. 19—22.

CHAPTER VI.

The Beauties of Power—a Chapter of Literary and Religious Gems scattered throughout Mr. Power's Book, and sparkling on almost every page.

Before resuming the general argument, it is deemed not improper or useless to present our readers with some specimens of our Methodist author's choice and favorite expressions—denoting, as they do, the kind of man that here undertakes to overthrow Universalism;—the spirit he possesses, or that "possesses" him; the nature of his Christianity, and his moral and religious sentiments and feelings; as well as the beauty, meekness, modesty, and chasteness of his mind, style, and language.

He speaks of Universalism as "an earth-born scheme, full of *deadly poison*"—p. 18; of the "subtle *evasions* of Universalists"—p. 37; "the latent *infidelity* of the system"—p. 48; says it is "impossible to save Universalism from the charge of *ignorance* in misunderstanding, or *wilfulness* in *perverting* the promises and Word of God"—p. 52; that it "must set the testimony of the Word of God at *open defiance*, and thereby proclaim its own infidelity"—p. 57; that it "takes the ground of undisguised infidelity"—p. 71; that Universalism depends more for success on *equivocation and evasion*,

than fair investigation"—p. 80; that Universalists are "*triflers* with Sacred Truth" —p. 82; of "stamping infidelity upon the whole system"—p. 83; frequently tells how Universalism "attempts to *escape*"—from him and his attacks!—that it "changes the DEITY with *dissimulation*"—p. 89; that a certain "admission seals the destiny of the system for *death*; while its denial will demonstrate its *infidelity*"—p. 97; stamps the whole system with the highest degree of *presumption*, not to say *blasphemy*"—p. 114; he speaks of Universalism as "rejecting the Bible as incompetent testimony in the case, and charging Christ and his apostles with *dissembling*"—p. 120; of "the *policy* of Universalism to *obscure* points in dispute"—p. 124; he calls Universalism "the *great deceiver* of mankind" —p. 135; says it "embraces both the Infidel and the Atheist in one common *brotherhood*"—p. 126; thereby meaning a *religious* "brotherhood;" exclaims, "What a *traitor* and *traducer* it must be, both of God and the Sacred Bible!"—p. 136; speaks of "its stores of *sublimity aud sophistry*"—p. 144; of "a *design* to divert the public attention from the real character of the system"—p. 144; "full of *arrogance* and *presumption*"—p.151; its "vain and presumptious *speculations*"—p. 158; "its preposterous *assumptions*, unscriptural *absurdities*, or its revolting *licentiousness*"—p. 158;

"the bold temerity of Universalism"—p. 159; that it disregards the majesty of God, and the sacredness of his Word"—p. 161; "guilty of an unpardonable and wicked perversion of the language and teaching of the Lord"—p. 171; "this covert infidelity—its ingenious perversion and misapplication of the Word of God"—p. 175; "it must pollute the lips of this holy man of God—consummate folly, exquisite nonsense"—p. 183; "its licentious assumptions"—p. 185; "prepared, with profane hands, to *rob* Jesus Christ of all consistency, etc., and insult him"—p. 187; "must be the legitimate offspring of the *grossest darkness*, or the deep disciplined corruption of Infidelity"—p. 189; "its *revolting atheistical* conclusions"—p. 192; "it not only *licences sin*, but virtually offers a *reward* to wickedness, and wages a relentless *war* against the whole Christian system!"—p. 193; "it stands condemned for its *worse* than *atheistical licentiousness*"—p. 207; "how inconceivably corrupt is the system!"—p. 208; "we have to follow the *serpent* sometimes into its own retreats and lurking places, before we can fully bruise its head"—p. 210; "Universalism is an *imposture*"—p. 216; "is *designedly* indefinite and obscure"—p. 219; "its opposition to the doctrine [of a future General Judgment] is *studied*, *malevolent*, *relentless*"—p. 242; "Infidelity in the *mask* of Universalism"—

p. 242; "open Infidelity"—p. 248; "this undisguised and revolting Infidelity"—p. 279; Universalism has "its paternity in the Infidelity and Atheism of France"—296; "its atheistical principles and dogmas"—p. 298; "it convicts itself of *unmingled falsehood and corruption*"—p. 306; "its deep and corrupt infidelity is complete"—p. 306; "its utter *deformity and depravity*"—p. 307; continually, and throughout the book, the author is insinuating or asserting that the advocates of Universalism try to *conceal* and *hide* its main doctrines—the most palpable of them, and the oftenest preached and defended; "when called to an account, Universalism *evades* explanation, retreats into *obscurity*, and shuns close observation"—p. 39; "1. The Divine Being contradicts and denies himself, and is infinitely insincere in his administration towards man: or, 2. The Bible is not the word and will of God to man, as a rule of faith and practice; or, 3. Universalism is utterly false, and a presumptious traducer of both God and his holy word"—p. 133–4; "Universalism, fully conscious that the community is not ripe for open Infidelity, by attempting to convict the Bible; nor for Atheism, by rejecting the Author of the Bible; and apprehensive, when pressed on this point, that itself must be convicted, flies, as to a city of refuge," etc.—p. 138–9; "therefore Universalism is a perfect farce, and all

its boast of universal holiness and happiness in the resurrection is disgusting nonsense. And if to avoid those consequences, which are not surpassed by the darkest feature of atheism, it admits the second coming of Jesus Christ to judge the world, and reward the good and punish the wicked is yet future, and will be consummated at the end of time and the present constitution of this world, it yields its last hope at once, and should prepare for a fearful reckoning and awful retribution at the bar of God, when it must meet the souls it has ruined, the Judge whose word it has perverted, whose government it has misrepresented, and whose character it has traduced "—p. 200; "the fruitless attempt at evasion, then amounts to this: Universalism, drawn from its concealment, pressed from every point by the force of Divine truth, and exposed in its true character to the light of the Holy Scriptures, rises in the *malevolence and infidelity* of its spirit, sets the word of God at *defiance*, joins issue with the throne, and charges God, in effect, with having given the world an improper revelation, and presumes to dictate to, and select the language, the Deity should have used in communicating his will to man"—pp. 278–9; "what more delightful *brotherhood*, could the boldest Infidelity, with all its malignity of spirit, and deadly hostility to the whole system of Christianity, desire, than it finds in Univer-

salism? Surely none"—p. 301; "what greater encouragement do the most *impious* want, who disbelieve the Word of God, and make it matter of profane trifling, than they find in Universalism?"—p. 302. The last two paragraphs of Mr. Power's book are couched in the following sublime and modest words—characteristic of the author's general style, eminently exhibiting the Christian spirit in which his whole work was performed—worthy of the man and of his religious system: "Universalism, in its logical and moral consequences, is as directly and absolutely opposed to the whole scheme of Christianity as revealed in the Bible, as open and undisguised infidelity itself.

"And if society is infested with such a species of infidelity, which has neither magnanimity nor honesty enough to appear in its own proper character, but throws around itself the sanctity of the name and profession of religion and Christianity, to avoid suspicion, and the better to conceal its real character and designs, and is thereby sowing the seeds of infidelity thick and fast in community, and endangering the highest interests of men in this and the eternal world, how can the ministers of the Lord Jesus Christ meet their divine Master in the final judgment, and give an account of their stewardship, if they do not arouse themselves to the work, and arrest the ravages

of this deadly moral poison, by exposing at once to public view its deep and malevolent infidelity, concealed under the specious and imposing name of liberal Christianity.

"This is not so difficult a task to perform as some might suppose. The better informed friends of the system know its indefensibleness here; they see and feel it sensibly; and there is no point on which they dread an attack more than on that of the development of its infidelity; and when attacked here, its most zealous votaries and able defenders cannot keep its utter deformity and depravity concealed, or prevent its exposure. To this point every lover of truth and honesty should bring it without delay; and there is a short method by which this may be accomplished; that is, by urging upon the system, wherever it is found, and demanding a direct answer to those inquiries proposed. Let every minister of eternal truth demand an answer; let every pious, let every honest man—let the Church, let the world demand a direct answer. Universalism is bound, in all justice and moral honesty, to give a direct answer, and to hesitate, must excite suspicion even in the minds of the incredulous, that the charge of infidelity against it is sustained. To refuse an answer, is to confirm this suspicion; and to answer, is to open its own sepulchre, as a warning to the world, and inscribe thereon, with its own hand, trem-

bling as in death, the following epitaph: 'UNIVERSALISM, HAVING NO HOPE, AND WITHOUT GOD IN THE WORLD.'"

CHAPTER VII.

DIVINE WILL AND PURPOSE.

Mr. Power commences his chapter on the Divine Will and Purpose, with the following paragraph:

> UNIVERSALISM, as if *convinced of the untenableness* of its position in relation to the promises, prophecies, and invitations of the Scriptures, *virtually abandons the ground*, and seeks protection under, and claims support from the sovereign, absolute will and purpose of God. Here it has thrown around itself a plausibility which has, doubtless, deceived, if not ruined many; and unless it is exposed in its true character, may deceive and ruin others." Pp. 121–2.

Here is one of those miserable insinuations with which Mr. Power's book abounds: that Universalism is always "convinced of the untenableness" of its positions and arguments, and is therefore willfully deceptive and hypocritical. A simple denial suffices for his declaration that Universalism "virtually abandons the ground" of God's "promises, prophecies," etc., in seeking support from the Divine will and purpose. It does *not* abandon that ground; but it appeals to God's will and purpose as the source and support of his promises, and the sure pledge of their fulfillment. The proofs of Universalism are varied, as well as numer-

ous—drawn from Scripture, the Divine nature and character, God's will and promises, the Divine attributes, nature, reason, and all that is good and holy in the universe; but, tried by our Methodist friend's Logic, stating a second argument or proof, is "abandoning" the first, and the giving of a seventh reason for the truth of a docrine, is giving up the previous six! How *could* Universalism stand, attacked by so discriminating a logician?

Let us now hear Mr. Power, on the nature of the Divine WILL, and of God's DESIRE, as distinguished from his will.

"The greatest errors have been passed off on the credulity of man, and rendered more or less current, by connecting them with some cardinal and important truths. Universalism has fully availed itself of this principle in the present case. And starting with the great truth that God had a will, or definite purpose in the creation of man, it imperceptibly to the unsuspecting, ASSUMES that this will, or sovereign purpose embraces the unconditional salvation of all mankind in heaven; and to cover this assumption, it asserts that the Divine will must imply this sovereign purpose, or a mere desire with regard to the final salvation of man.—And having really, or supposedly refuted the latter, it claims with great confidence to be supported by the former. One fruitful source of error in matters of religion is, in attributing to the Divine Being more or less of those properties and operations of mind that we see belonging to man, among which is *that of desire*. That God may possess desire in some peculiar and qualified sense, may be admitted; but that he desires in the same sense that man does is wholly inadmissible. For desire in man always

implies a future object, with more or less *uncertainty*, with regard to its attainment and enjoyment. And if the object desired be, when obtained, what he expected, its possession increases his happiness; if otherwise, his happiness is diminished or prevented, by the disappointment and mortification. All this is the result of his limited knowledge and wisdom to choose, and limited power to execute. But as God is *infinite* in his perfections, and immutably happy in himself, he cannot be the subject of desire in the same sense that man is. No new acquisition can increase his immutable happiness; *and he cannot be the subject of disappointment*, by which it could be diminished: from which it is clear, that any arguments drawn from the desires of man, must be radically erroneous when applied to God. These facts should be kept in view in the inquiry on the will of God; and how far, and in what respect that will is sovereign and absolute, in relation to the salvation of man." Pp. 122–3.

Much of this is very well—enough to overthrow some of the main principles of Arminianism. But it is *not true*, as Mr. P. asserts, that Universalism "ASSUMES" that God's will embraces the unconditional salvation of all mankind:—it PROVES it, by the revelation of his will in the Scriptures. He says, however, that it is "a great *truth* that God had a will, or *definite purpose* in the creation of man"; and if it were not to finally save all—to bring all to a state of holiness and happiness, we might ask, What was it? was it God's "will and definite purpose" to damn some of his creatures, and shut them up in a state of endless unholiness and unhappiness? In the eye of

enlightened reason, which would be most worthy of God, the Father of all?

The careful reader will observe how perfectly Mr. Power explodes the common Arminian notions of God's desire, as equivalent to his will, in such passages as 1 Tim. ii. 4: God "WILL have all men to be saved." Commonly it is argued that this "will" is merely DESIRE, and may therefore not be accomplished. But Mr. Power says, and truly, that God does not desire in the same sense that man does—that there is *no* "uncertainty" about the attainment of God's desire; for, being "infinite in his perfections," possessing unlimited knowledge, wisdom and power, "he *can not* be the subject of disappointment." We may have occasion again to allude to this admission, during the progress of this Review.

Mr. Power then proceeds to show the distinction between God's will of purpose, as the rule or principle of the Divine action, and his will as the rule of human actions in this life. The Divine will, as "the rule of human actions," need not enter into the controversy; for, upon this point, all may agree: it is the will of PURPOSE of which we speak; and on that this part of the controversy turns. Let us then hear Mr. Power admit enough on this subject, and give Scripture proofs enough, to establish all we claim, and utterly overthrow and nullify all the pleadings of Arminianism:

"The will of God may be considered, first, as the rule or principle of Divine action; in this sense it is absolute and resistless. "Yea, before the day was, I am he; and there is none that can deliver out of my hand: I will work and who shall let (or hinder) it?" Isaiah xliii, 13. "And all the inhabitants of the earth are reputed as nothing: and he doeth according to his will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth: and none can stay his hand, or say unto him, what doest thou? Daniel iv, 35. "Thou wilt say then unto me, Why doth he yet find fault? For who hath resisted his will?" Rom. ix, 19. "In whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will," Eph. i, 11. The Divine will in this absolute sense, governed the entire economy of human redemption, and reigns in the administration of God in the kingdom of his providence."[12]

Now, let it be remembered, that Mr. P. admits that God's will, "as the rule or principle of the Divine action is ABSOLUTE AND RESISTLESS." Let it be remembered, too, that this is the admission of a *truth;* for it is abundantly and irrefutably established by the passages of Scripture quoted by Mr. P. This is all we ask, and sufficient to establish the doctrine of final universal salvation. Consequently, we need not wade through Mr. P.'s wordy argument concerning the Divine will, as "the rule of *human actions.*"

There is no dispute about "the rule of human *actions;*" it is about "the rule or principle of the DIVINE action," with regard

to human *destiny*. If we prove that the Divine *will of purpose*, as above defined, embraces man's final destiny—his happy destiny, the question is forever settled, beyond cavil or dispute; for Mr. Power admits *that* will to be "ABSOLUTE and RESISTLESS."

Before proving this, however, let us notice some of Mr. P.'s twattle on the subject of the Divine will, as "the rule of human actions." He says, in one of his most substantial and convincing syllogisms:

"The Divine will, as the rule of human conduct, must either, 1. Include none of the moral dispositions of the heart, and moral actions of the life; or, 2. It must include only a part of them; or, 3. It must extend its claims to all the moral dispositions of the heart, and all the moral actions of the life of man." P. 125.

Well—*what of it?*—what has all that to do with man's final destiny, as affected by the Divine will?

It may be as well to remark here, concerning the Divine will as the rule of human conduct—which is not the question, properly in dispute,—that Universalists differ on that subject, the same as Partialists do. Some Partialists are Predestinarians; and so are some Universalists. Some Partialists are Arminians; and so are some Universalists, so far as this question is concerned. Consequently, neither one view of the subject is peculiar or essential to Universalism, any more than it is to Partialism;

and hence can properly have no place in a controversy between the two systems.—Much of Mr. P.'s chapter on the Divine will is utterly irrelevant, and belongs more properly to a book against common Calvinism, than to one against Universalism; for that doctrine is a *peculiarity* of the former, as it is *not* a peculiarity of the latter. The proper inquiry is—and the only one that has any legitimate place in this chapter—Does God's will, as "the rule or principle of the Divine action," embrace the final destiny of all mankind? and is it that Divine will that all men shall finally be saved and happy? If so, the question is settled; and Universalism, *in its main and peculiar dogma*, proved beyond all doubt or cavil; for Mr. Power admits and *proves* that this Will is "*absolute and* RESISTLESS."

With reference to this inquiry, Mr. P. examines 1 Tim. ii. 4, and Eph. i. 9, 10, 11, in connection with Rev. A. C. Thomas' argument founded on those passages, in his Discussion with Rev. E. S. Ely; but does by no means set aside either the proof or the argument, that God "will have all men to be saved and come unto the knowledge of the truth." Now, is this "will" the rule of *human conduct?* or is it the purpose of God? The answer is found in the passage itself: being the SALVATION of all men, it it of course depends on God, and is not the mere rule of man's actions. It is necessa-

rily suspended on the Almighty's "absolute and resistless will." So with the other passage—Eph. i. 9, 10, 11: "Having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure which he hath purposed in himself: that in the dispensation of the fulness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; even in him: in whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his OWN WILL." This one passage ought to suffice to end this whole controversy. For mark: it is not only God's "will," but his "*good pleasure;* and not only both his will and pleasure, but his "PURPOSE"—what he hath "purposed IN HIMSELF," and not in man.—Hence, this relates to the "principle or rule of the *Divine* action," and not to the rule of human conduct. Again; it is here said that it is God's will, good pleasure, and purpose, "that HE [God] might gather together in one all things in Christ;" which is to be accomplished "in the dispensation of the fullness of times." The passage therefore relates to what GOD does, or will do; and not to what is *required* of men. It concerns the absolute and irresistible will of the Omnipotent. And finally, as if to meet and preclude all idea of failure here, the Apostle adds, "According to the pur-

pose of HIM WHO WORKETH *all things after the counsel of* HIS OWN WILL." In face of such an unequivocal and explicit declaration of God's Word, as this, how utterly senseless and futile are all Arminian attacks on the Universalist argument founded on the Divine Will and Purpose! God's eternal Throne rests no more firmly and securely, than does man's immortal destiny on the Divine Will.

But let us return to Mr. Power's effort to set aside the force of 1 Tim. ii. 4: God "WILL HAVE all men to be saved." He says "it is the will of God that man should be saved from sin, and come to the knowledge of the truth *in this life*, or it is not his will." Well, it is NOT his will that all should be saved in this life; from the fact that he does not give all an *opportunity* of being thus saved. Millions of millions live and die without knowing how they may be saved in this life, or in the next. "The truth" has not been revealed to them, nor the *means* of salvation, according to Methodism: what, then, is God's "will" concerning them? Eph. i. 9—11, shows that God's "will" concerning man's final happy destiny relates to "the dispensation of the *fullness* of times;" and not to this life. Moreover, in the verses immediately succeeding 1 Tim. ii. 4, it is said that the "one Mediator between God and men, gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in DUE TIME;"

that is, the testimony of the *result*, the accomplishment of the object, would be given "in due time." So far as the real issue is affected, it is an utter waste of time to discuss the question of man's condition or duty *in this life;* and almost the whole of Mr. Power's chapter on the Divine Will and Purpose, is wholly irrelevant, and serves only to divert the reader's attention from the essential point.

As a specimen of Mr. P.'s argumentation on this subject, take the following paragraphs, on pp. 129, 130–2–4:

"To demonstrate this: God either has, or has not, made provision for man's salvation from sin in this life. To assert that he has not, while he says, "Look unto me and be ye saved, all ye ends of the earth;" and "Behold, now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation;" is presumptuously to impeach the Divine veracity, and contradict the Almighty. And if he has made this provision for, and offers it to man, *it is the Divine will, or it is not, that man should now be saved from sin.* To say that God has made this provision, and offers salvation to man, but is not willing that he should now be saved, is to charge infinite wisdom, truth, and goodness, with folly, falsehood, and cruelty.—The conclusion is, therefore, inevitable, that it is the will of God that man should be saved from sin in this world. But are all men thus saved? Matters of fact are standing proof to the contrary.

If man can oppose the will of God in rejecting the salvation provided for, and offered to him in this world, and live and die in sin, unless the immutable Jehovah can change, man may be sinful and miserable eternally. Universalism, aware of this, takes the ground that man in no case whatev-

er can act contrary to the Divine will. Mr. Davis in the discussion already alluded to, stated that "man is a free agent—he is free to behold, with admiration and delight, all the beauties of nature and art; but to talk about man's freedom in opposition to the will of God, is like plucking God from his throne!"

"According to this scheme, God is the absolute and efficient cause, and man only the unresisting and obedient instrument of all the conduct of mankind. Then look abroad upon this blood-polluted globe, and behold the scenes rising in awful gradation, from the deliberate murder of an unoffending brother, till crime increasing in magnitude, martials nation against nation, in the attitude of vengeance, and till the bosom of the vast deep is stained, and the thirsty earth bathed with human blood; and then reflect, that this is but a single specimen of what has been transpiring for ages; and unless God should change, and become willing that man should be saved from his sin in this "present world," they must be continued while the world stands. What a horrid imputation this on the character of the Almighty!

God has proclaimed to man, "Be ye holy, for I am holy," Lev. xi. 44; 1 Peter i, 16. But if he has willed that men should not be holy, but live and die in sin and unholiness, he denies himself, and gives the clearest proof that he delights more in the corruption and unholiness of man in this world than in his holiness, his own Divine declarations to the contrary notwithstanding. And if this is not *infinite insincerity*, actions and language have no meaning."

After remarking that it is *not true*, as above intimated, and as Arminianism often asserts, that salvation is "offered to all men," in this life, I will meet and refute all Mr. Power's arguments and declam-

ation, by simply quoting the 8th Article of Religion in his creed—the Methodist Discipline;—showing that if all he says avails anything against Universalism, *as it does not*, it avails as much against Methodism. The following is Art. 8, of the Methodist Creed, as found in "the little book:"

"The condition of man after the fall of Adam is such, that he CAN NOT *turn and prepare himself*, by his own natural strength and works, to *faith and calling upon God;* wherefore we have NO POWER *to do good works*, pleasant and acceptable to God, without the GRACE OF GOD by Christ *preventing us*, [that is, *going before* us,] that we may HAVE *a good will*, and working *with* us, when we *have* that good will."

Here we learn that, according to Mr. P.'s creed, all of man's destiny, or his having faith, and calling upon God, having a good will, and doing good works, depends upon GOD, and not upon himself,—that he "*can not*" do anything—has "*no power*" to do God's will or good works, without "the grace of God *preventing* him"—the word "preventing" being used in the former sense of it, and as found in the Bible. What, then, becomes of Mr. P.'s blustering declamation about God's "*infinite insincerity*," in calling upon men to be holy, and to have faith, and call upon him, when he does not help them—remembering that, according to his creed, they can do nothing without his help, his efficient help? Who now throws the "horrid imputation on the

character of the Almighty!" Where now is all the stuff about God's "delighting in the corruption and unholiness of man in this world," when all depends upon what God does; man being able "of himself" to do nothing?

"According to what scheme," does it now appear, that "God is the *absolute and efficient cause*, and man only the unresisting and obedient instrument of all the conduct of mankind?" Every word of Mr. Power's denunciatory declamation rebounds upon his own pate, or at least falls upon his own system! It avails nothing against the doctrine of universal salvation, "in the dispensation of the fullness of times." And after all, and always, let it be remembered that, be this matter as it may, the question of man's immortal destiny, as suspended on the Divine Will and Purpose, is not affected in the slightest degree; and our present notice of Mr. P.'s arguments is merely from courtesy, and not because properly belonging to the discussion of the doctrines *peculiar* to Universalism; for these are matters of philosophical and metaphysical speculation between Calvinism and Arminianism. So far as Universalism is concerned, it is only necessary to prove that man's final destiny is embraced in that Will of God, which is "the rule or principle of the Divine action;" for that, says Mr. P., and that, the Bible attests, "*is absolute and resistless.*"

And this we have proved, in this chapter, and will hereafter more fully prove, in such a manner that Methodism, with all its Powers, can not successfully gainsay it.

As Universalism, and not Methodism, is the doctrine under consideration, I shall not dwell upon the common absurdities of Arminianism; how it represents God as making man for unfailing holiness and happiness on earth; but that the Devil circumvented him, and led man into sin, in spite of God!—how then God provided a Savior, who suffered as a substitute for man, and died instead of all men, that all might go to heaven, and escape the Hell they deserved; but that owing to man's free agency,—which the Creed shows is *not* free,—those sufferings will be in vain, and utterly futile, a perfect waste of blood and agony, so far as millions of human souls are concerned!—how God desires or wills that all men should be eternally saved; but thwarted and frustrated by the Devil or man's sins, myriads on myriads shall sink down to everlasting and hopeless despair, in spite of God's will and of all his efforts to save them!—that, in a thousand things, the Omnipotent Jehovah CAN NOT do what he would; but circumvented by the Evil Intelligence, or successfully resisted by the Agency that he gave, he utterly and forever FAILS to accomplish the desires of his boundless Benevolence!—that the Almighty would like

to bring all human intelligences into his immortal kingdom; but he is *not able* to effect this, because Satan, by his cunning and power, will secure the control of innumerable multitudes of those intelligences—God's OFFSPRING, to grace his triumph over God, and to fill his dark realms of sin and woe! !—and yet how, after all its blustering about Free Agency, the freedom of man's will, it teaches that, just as soon as this Free Agent *dies*, he will be *shut up* in Hell, enclosed within the bars of irresistible FATE, where he CAN NOT reform, and obey and love God, if he would; but be *compelled*, so to speak, to sin and suffer as long as the God of holiness and benevolence shall exist!!

I need not further illustrate the utter IMPOTENCE which Arminianism ascribes to the Infinite Supreme; but simply remark, in closing this chapter, that it is most unbecoming for Mr. Power, or any Arminian, to affect to ridicule and denounce, as wicked and absurd, the Universalist views of the Divine Will and Purpose! What we believe on this subject, is explicitly expressed, beyond the reach of Arminian cavil or perversion, in the passage already quoted:—"Having made known to us the mystery of his WILL, according to his GOOD PLEASURE, which he has PURPOSED IN HIMSELF; [and not in man:] that in the dispensation of the fullness of times, HE [God] might

gather together IN ONE ALL THINGS IN CHRIST, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth, even in HIM: in whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being PREDESTINED according to the PURPOSE of HIM, [the Almighty,] who WORKETH [*in fact*, absolutely and resistlessly] all things after the counsel of HIS OWN WILL;" [not according to man's will or agency, or the cunning and might of the Devil!] Eph. i. 9—11.

CHAPTER VIII.

FOREKNOWLEDGE.

Mr. Power closes his chapter on the Divine Will and Purpose, with the following elegant paragraph:

"Any other view of this subject must impeach every perfection of the Divine character, or convict the Bible as the grossest deception ever passed off upon mankind. Universalism, fully conscious that the community is not ripe for open infidelity, by attempting to convict the Bible; nor for atheism, by rejecting the author of the Bible; and apprehensive, when pressed on this point, that itself must be convicted, flies, as to a city of refuge, to the foreknowledge of God, and attempts to seek protection there, from the gathering storm." Pp. 138-9.

He therefore devotes his next chapter to the Divine Foreknowledge; but, in view of his usual verbosity, wonderful to say, he wastes but five pages on this subject!

In the first place, Mr. Power either misunderstands or misrepresents the Universalist argument founded on the Divine Foreknowledge. We contend that, as God absolutely knows or foreknows all things and all events, he knew, before he created man, what man would do—the result of whatever moral freedom he should bestow upon him—and his final destiny. Consequently, if that destiny is to be remedilessly evil, and

his existence a curse, God knew and *designed it;* which is an impeachment of his Benevolence. Our argument therefore is, that no man's final destiny will be remedilessly evil, because God's goodness is infinite and universal, as well as his knowledge; so that he never would have created man, knowing that his existence would prove a curse! But instead of meeting the argument as it is, Mr. P. wastes all his amunition of syllogism and Logic on the idea, attributed to Universalists, that, because God foreknows all events, therefore all human actions, holy or sinful, are ordained of God, and *necessary.* As a specimen of his argumentation, take the following paragraph:

"That the subject of the Divine foreknowledge may be understood, so far as man's practice is concerned, it may be remarked, that the foreknowledge, as revealed in the Holy Scriptures, must refer to, and include the infinite wisdom and knowledge of God, or it does not. To say that it does not, is to exclude the infinite wisdom and knowledge of God from his foreknowledge, or to maintain that the Divine foreknowledge exists without either wisdom or knowledge. This is a contradiction—an absurdity. And if the foreknowledge of God refers to, and includes his infinite wisdom and knowledge, it must imply either, 1. His infinite wisdom and knowledge alone; or, 2. It must imply more than his infinite wisdom and knowledge; or, 3. It must imply less than his infinite wisdom and knowledge. To allow that foreknowledge is a perfection of the Divine nature and character, and assert that it is less than his infinite wisdom and knowledge, is to maintain that God has, at least one perfection of his

nature that is not infinite; and of consequence, he is not absolutely infinite in his nature, character, and perfections. Such a conclusion would be a near approach to atheism."

Well, *what of it?* what does all that amount to? Does not every reader see that it is the merest *twattle* to talk about God's foreknowledge being "more" or "less" than his "infinite wisdom and knowledge," or that "alone," and any perfection being "less than infinite"? and yet the whole paragraph is written with a seriousness and gravity, and an array of dilemmas or trilemmas, that is truly astounding!—put forth with an air that seems to say, This settles it! As the result of his labored syllogism, Mr. Power sagely concludes that the foreknowledge of God is "nothing more nor less than his infinite wisdom and knowledge, operating in perfect harmony with every other perfection and attribute of his nature and character." All very well;—and because God's love and benevolence are infinite and universal, he never created a being who his infinite knowledge saw would be consigned to a state of endless sin and woe, by any means, or from any cause, whatever. Let Mr. P. array his syllogisms [or *silly* gisms] against the argument, as thus stated; and not waste his time and breath in proving what nobody denies! God's infinite knowledge of course embraces all events, past, present, and future; but to

specify or designate the exercise of that knowledge with respect to futurity, we use the term *fore*knowledge. While on this subject, Mr. Power might have usefully reviewed Dr. Adam Clarke's *denial* that God absolutely knows or foreknows *all events*—even the final doom of a single individual soul!—a subterfuge to which this most learned and eminent of all Methodist comentators was driven, in order to avoid and evade the force of the impeachment of the Divine GOODNESS, implied in the doctrine that God made one human soul, knowing or foreknowing that its existence would prove a remediless curse! This learned Methodist, unlike Mr. Power, preferred an ignorant God, to a malevolent God! But how much better than either, to believe in an infinitely wise and benevolent God!

Almost the whole of Mr. P.'s chapter on Foreknowledge is devoted to combatting the notion that because God *foreknows* events, therefore they are *necessary*; that, if they are *not* necessary, Universalism derives no support from the Divine Foreknowledge; while if they *are* necessary, most awful moral consequences follow. But this entire controversy belongs to Calvinism—and Mr. P.'s arguments are arrayed against Calvinism; and not peculiarly against Universalism; for all Universalists are no more Calvinistic, than are all Partialists. Universalism does no more teach the absolute

necessity of things foreknown, than does Partialism. True, some Universalists, in their metaphysical and philosophical speculations, take the Calvinistic view of the Divine Foreknowledge, and of Necessity—as they have a right to do, unimpunged by friend or foe; the same as the great Methodist commentator asserts that God does not know all things, as he had a perfect right to do. But the Calvinistic view of God's Foreknowledge is no more Universalism, or peculiar and essential to that system of faith, than is the idea of an ignorant God, Methodism, or essential to that system. When Partialists settle these questions among themselves, they may consistently attack doctrines that some of us hold in common with some of them; and not before. Till then, let them confine themselves to opposing doctrines *peculiar* to the system of Universalism; and, on the subject of Foreknowledge, *reconcile man's creation with God's infinite benevolence, if to ultimate in endless evil, foreknown*, or simply *known*. This, Methodism with all its *Powers*, never has done, and never can do. It possesses neither knowledge, nor foreknowledge, nor free agency enough to accomplish this. It came the nearest to it, perhaps, when its great expositor asserted that the Creator *does not know all things;* so that, if a human soul should be endlessly cursed, God did not know it when he crea-

ted the world! Consequently, the Creator is relieved from the charge of malevolence; but at the expense of his knowledge and prudence—to say nothing of the careless risk that ALL souls might be forever lost! the wanton *thoughtlessness* manifested in throwing out innumerable souls upon the world, to take the unknown *chance* of being endlessly damned—in a Hell which Himself made, not knowing whether one soul would inhabit it, or whether it would be the final home of all! Such is the character of God, with relation to the creation and destiny of man, according to the Methodist Dr. Clarke; but, according to the Methodism of Mr. Power, God *did* know what individual souls would make Hell their final dwelling place, when he made them and it! Thus, while admitting God's infinite knowledge and wisdom, in the sense of *foreknowledge*, it detracts from his impartial and infinite *philanthropy* in creation; or else from his *wisdom* to plan the desired result, demanded by love; or else from his *power* to accomplish his benevolent will! How infinitely superior to this, and how much more worthy of God, is the Universalist doctrine, that the Father of our spirits is infinite in *all* his perfections and attributes, —that, "seeing the end from the beginning," he had benevolence enough to design, wisdom enough to plan, and power to accomplish, a glorious immortal destiny for

all his intelligent creatures!—despite the omnipotent and all-wise, but malevolent God of Calvin, or the kind and tender hearted, but ignorant and impotent God of the Methodist Clarke! One is the God of the Bible; the other is the God of pagan-born creeds. The latter is entitled neither to our admiration, our reverence, or our love; but the former is worthy of the highest and purest adoration and love of all human intelligences.

CHAPTER IX.

PATERNAL LOVE OF GOD.

The seventh chapter of Mr. Power's book is an effort, feeble as boastful, to meet and refute the argument in favor of final universal salvation, drawn from the *paternal love of God.* The argument is, that, as the Bible represents God as "the FATHER of spirits," "the Father of all," "the God of the spirits of all flesh," that relationship is a sufficient guaranty that the existence of no individual spirit will prove an endless curse;—that, as a Father, whose nature is LOVE, he could not have created a race of human intelligences, without knowing, and designing, and effecting, that their existence should, on the whole, prove a blessing. And no Partialist, from the days of Tertullian, down to the eldership of John H. Power, has been able to reconcile the final and remediless misery of a single human soul, with the paternal love of God—infinite, impartial, perfect, and universal; and from the very nature of the case, every such effort must necessarily be futile and vain. Mr. P. seeks to annul the force of the Universalist argument, by affirming that if the paternal love of God is to effect the *final* salvation of all men, it would effect

their *present* happiness; that, as he is infinitely good now, and does not make all men holy and happy, in this life, that goodness affords no proof that he *ever will* bring all to a state of holiness and happiness; so that, as the paternal love of God permits manifold evils *now*, it may *perpetuate* them to all eternity. This is the sum and substance and gist of his argument, without its verbose declamation.

The elegant paragraph with which Mr. P. opens this chapter, contains one of his manifold charges against Universalism, as being full of "subtilty and sophistry," with one of his frequent charitable insinuations that Universalism "*designs* to divert public attention from its real character"; which *he*, however,—most discerning and penetrating and modest man!—has been able perfectly to exhibit and expose! He says, on page 144:

"Universalism has long been in the habit of exhausting its stores of subtilty and sophistry, in so magnifying some of the perfections of God, and some of his relations to man, as thereby to obscure and virtually destroy others, and practically annihilate the harmony of the Divine character and administration.

Doubtless this course has been, and still is, so tenaciously adhered to, with a design to divert public attention from the real character of the system, and thereby escape exposure."

Passing over the contemptible insinuations already alluded to, let us examine the

declaration that Universalism "so magnifies some of the perfections of God, etc., as thereby to *obscure*, and virtually *destroy others*, and practically annihilate the *harmony* of the Divine character and administration." True, we "magnify some of the perfections of God;" but not "some" *only:* we magnify them *all*. We "obscure" none—and do not "annihilate the harmony of the Divine character." Indeed, ours is the only Faith under heaven, that represents all the Divine attributes and perfections as acting in entire and everlasting HARMONY. All forms of Partialism in general, and Methodism in particular, represent God's *Mercy* for instance, as pleading for the salvation of all, while vindictive *Justice* sternly forbids it, and demands the endless damnation of all!—and that, in so far as one of these attributes is satisfied, the other is violated!—and that, by a sort of compromise, Mercy is permitted to effect the salvation of some, while the rest are to be delivered over to the tenderness of Justice! And yet the advocate of such doctrines talks about Universalism "annihilating the harmony of the Divine character"!!

Mr. Power thus states the argument which he vainly attempts to refute:

"As God is called a Father in the Scriptures, the system argues that all good earthly fathers will consult the best possible good of their offspring; and the only reason their children are not com-

pletely happy, is, the want of wisdom in their parents to devise, and power to effect their benevolent designs for their children. But God, as a Father, is not only infinite in goodness, moving him to consult the best possible good of his children; but he is infinite in wisdom to devise, and power to execute his benevolent plans for the greatest happiness of man; and as the unconditional salvation of all mankind in heaven is the greatest possible good to man, if God has not designed this, he is less good to his children than an earthly father. This supposition would impeach the Divine goodness and love. But infinite goodness has designed this for man, and infinite wisdom has devised this scheme, and infinite power is pledged for the accomplishment of the whole work; and to suppose that any part thereof will fail, is to deny his infinite power, and consequently destroy the Divine character. In this argument, the paternal relation and love of God are so exalted, as to render all his perfections, and all other relations to man, merely *subservient to these*, in order to reach the conclusion that all men must absolutely be saved in heaven." Pp. 144–5.

Well, why *should not* every perfection of God be "*subservient*" to his paternal love? As his nature, his essence, his name is LOVE, why should we not suppose all the attributes of God to be the attributes of Love? Are they the attributes of Hate?

Mr. P. has pretty fairly stated our argument: now let us observe his attempts to refute it:

"By the same process of reasoning, a directly opposite conclusion may be arrived at. For example: the infinite holiness of God must prompt him to inflict the *greatest possible punishment* on all who oppose his holiness; but the greatest punishment is their unconditional and endless perdition in the fu-

future world, and if he does not inflict this on the sinner, he is disregardless of his holiness. But as the infinite holiness of God cannot be impeached, he has designed this punishment, and infinite wisdom, in accordance with the dictates of infinite justice, has devised the scheme; and to prevent the possibility of a failure, the infinite power is pledged to execute what infinite holiness, wisdom, and justice have designed. But who have sinned and opposed the holiness and justice of God? "We all, like sheep, have gone astray," Isaiah liii, 6. "All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God," Rom. iii, 33. *Therefore, all men must be endlessly punished.*

This argument on the infinite holiness and justice of God, for the final, endless perdition of all men, is precisely as sound and strong as that of Universalism on the infinite goodness and paternal relation of God, for the absolute, final salvation of all men. It is, therefore, indisputably clear that a mode of reasoning that will support conclusions so diametrically opposite, must be absolutely sophistical, and utterly false."

Here is Logic, worthy the genius of a Methodist Presiding Elder!—"If the infinite LOVE of our heavenly Father prompts him to secure *the greatest happiness* of his children, his infinite HOLINESS prompts him to inflict the *greatest possible punishment* on those who oppose his holiness—even their endless perdition in the future world"!!

Should we not rather suppose thot God's Holiness would seek to bring about final universal holiness, rather than prompt to the "infliction of the greatest possible punishment" on the unholy? On the infinite

Holiness of our Father, therefore, we found an argument for universal salvation.

But look again: God's Holiness "prompts him to inflict the GREATEST POSSIBLE PUNISHMENT on those who oppose his holiness." "*The greatest possible punishment*"!—as great as the infinite Jehovah, the All-wise, the Omnipotent, the irresistibly Mighty can inflict, with all the exercise of his skill and power, by the aid of all devils, demons, and infernal spirits, in a Hell of unutterable, immortal, remediless, ceaseless agonies and torments!! And this is the promptings of the "infinite HOLINESS of God," according to Methodism!

But look once more: "The INFINITE Holiness of God" demands this infliction of "endless perdition" in Hell. Well, then, what can *set aside* the demand? what can meet it? If INFINITE,—and it *is* infinite—what can suffice to relieve a single soul from enduring "*the geatest possible punishment*," if Holiness demands that? The blood of Christ—all his sufferings, and agony, and death? *No!*—for all that is no *more* than infinite, even on highest Trinitarian grounds: and cannot avail against any thing else that is infinite. Can even God's infinite Mercy, or Love, or Goodness, or Wisdom, or Power, be sufficient to set aside the claims of infinite Holiness? Every body must at once say, No. What then? Why, as Mr. Power truly says, inasmuch

as all men are sinners, "ALL MEN MUST BE ENDLESSLY PUNISHED!—universal, endless damnation, without escape or remedy! And I challenge Methodism, with all its Power, to resist this conclusion, if the premises are correct, and if the argument avails anything against the Universalist argument drawn from the paternal love of God. O Methodism! to what straits art thou driven, in the prosecution of thy unholy war against heavenly Truth!

We come now to Mr. P.'s other argument, drawn from the fact that God's paternal love permits evils *now*, that earthly parents would prevent, if they could; from which he argues that he may *perpetuate* those evils to all eternity. Hear him:

"From all those facts, it follows, without a doubt either, 1. That the reasoning of Universalism on this point is wholly false; and that in view of all the perfections of God, and his relations to man, it is perfectly consistent with his character and government to allow men to suffer in this world, (and unless the *Immutable can change, in the endless world also*, in consequence of their depravity and sins,) what good earthly fathers would deliver their children from, if they had the means and the power; or, 2. That God is deficient in goodness, wisdom, and power; or, 3. That his goodness requires and his wisdom and power procure, all the human sufferings in the universe, as necessarily connected with, and leading to, man's greatest good and final salvation.

To admit the first, would be alike totally ruinous on this point to the logic and theology of Universalism. To affirm the second, would be con-

summately wicked; and the system has no ground to occupy but the third--that God requires all that man does and suffers in this world, as essential parts of, and means, in his absolute holiness and happiness in heaven."

The argument amounts to this: Whatever God permits or ordains, *now*, and for a limited period, and to effect some ultimate good object, he may *forever* permit. Well, God permits the SAINTS—even the most pious Methodists, to suffer NOW: consequently, they will have to endure ENDLESS sufferings!

But, says Mr. P., earthly parents would not permit their children to suffer *at all*, if they were able to prevent it. *Yes, they would*, if they possessed wisdom and power enough, AS OUR HEAVENLY FATHER DOES, to OVERRULE all present suffering for the ultimate highest good of the sufferer.—Sometimes, indeed, where a desired end can be attained only by inflicting suffering, the most fervent love of an earthly father will cause his dearest child to suffer most poignantly; as in inflicting chastisement, giving medicine, or amputating broken limbs. *The existence of* EVIL, under the government of an infinitely benevolent, wise and powerful God, is an unfathomable deep. *Why* evil is permitted, we can not tell.—*How* it will result in good, *in all cases*, we know not. Relying on the Word of God, we can only BELIEVE that all suffering will finally terminate, and be overruled for good.

On this topic, Mr. P. indulges, as usual, in a vast amount of anti-Calvinistic declamation; after the following fashion:

"Here God as father, out of love to his children, is represented as procuring, by infinite wisdom and power, all the sins of mankind in their aggravations, with all the consequent sufferings and anguish of the human family; and all this too, that he may be very gracious at last in saving them, after having purposed and procured all their sins, and inflicted upon them all the miseries that men have endured for more than five thousand years. What but Universalism could thus traduce the Divine character! This argument of the system, while it represents God as the Father of the human family, and his children "moved by necessity," in all their "volitions" and "actions," makes, by unavoidable consequences, the Lord of infinite holiness and justice, as well as wisdom and power, the actual author of all the crimes committed on earth, by "moving" his children to quarrel, fight, oppress, and murder each other; and then punishes them for submitting to his purpose with regard to them."

Mr. P. exhibits a great deal of Methodist horror here; but what does it all amount to —even granting that Universalists teach all that he asserts, and declaims against? Suppose we grant, as Universalists will not affirm, that God *does* absolutely COMPEL men to sin and suffer in this life, with the design of thereby ultimately effecting their highest happiness, when the period shall arrive when there shall be no more pain, or death, or darkness, or evil; but universal happiness, life, light, and good prevail, without

interruption and without end. Is not this idea infinitely more worthy of God than the crude speculations of Arminianism on the subject of sin and suffering? Ah! says Methodism, man sinned *voluntarily*, and by free *volition;* and therefore ought to be endlessly damned; and his endless perdition is no impeachment of the paternal love of God. But did not God *create* man *liable* to sin, knowing that he *would* sin?—unless we say with the Methodist Dr. Clarke, that God does *not* know all things! And did not the Creator and Father bestow on man that Agency, or freedom of the will, by which he sinned, perfectly foreseeing the results of it? Was this *designed?*—or was God DISAPPOINTED?! Are sin and evil *accidents* in God's universe, unforseen and undesigned? and was the All-wise really frustrated and disappointed by the action of the powers that Himself gave to his children? Heavens! I would rather believe all the fables of the Koran, than this! But then, says Arminianism again, the Devil tempted our first parents, and tempts us.—Well, did not God *create* the Devil, knowing all that he would do? and did he not *expose* men to his wiles? and did he not *let* the Devil come and mar his fair moral universe? Or, will it be said that the Almighty Father was outwitted and circumvented by his Arch Adversary; and that Satan accomplished the deed of darkness, in

SPITE OF GOD?! Once more; Methodism says God has *provided* salvation for all, and *offers* it to all; and all *may be saved*, if they will; and if they choose to go to Hell, why God's government is blameless. But salvation is *not* offered to all men: millions on millions live and die, without once hearing of the Savior or of his salvation. Moreover, God knows that millions to whom he does offer salvation will not accept it; and he knew it before he *created* them. Hence the offer is but mockery! And then the notion so unworthy of the Almighty, that he desires and seeks to accomplish what he *can not* accomplish; but is doomed everlastingly TO FAIL, on account of the exercise of the powers that himself bestowed on man, plainly foreseeing "the end from the beginning!" And finally, and worst of all, Methodism, and every form of Partialism teaches that God, instead of finally *terminating* all evil, and *overruling* it for good, will PERPETUATE it to all eternity, to mar his fair universe, and blast the souls of his intelligent offspring!—that he will place myriads of human spirits beyond the reach of mercy, or the arm of love; where they NEVER CAN seek and obey the God of love, the Father of all! And yet the advocate of such notions, can charge Universalism with "traducing the Divine character"!! What Universalism teaches,—aside from the metaphysical or philosophical speculations of

individual Universalists, Calvinistic or Arminian,—is clearly and fully expressed in Rom. viii. 20, 21: "For the creature"—that is, the human CREATION—"WAS MADE *subject to vanity*, NOT WILLINGLY, but by reason of HIM"—God—"who hath subjected the same in hope; because the creature itself"—or this creation—"SHALL BE DELIVERED from the bondage of corruption"—which all now endure—"into the glorious liberty of the children of God." Let Methodism and its Powers, blow their blasts, and drive their mists, and roar and foam, against this Rock!

I can not forbear quoting, with a remark or two, the following paragraph, on a subject already alluded to—the harmony of all the Divine attributes:

"The first feature of this error opposes the unity of the Divine nature, by obscuring the perfect and immutable equality, *infinite and eternal harmony* of those perfections that belong to and constitute that Divine nature; for it is no less true, that God is infinite and immutable in *holiness, justice and truth*, than it is that he is infinite in goodness, wisdom, and power. Any argument that would destroy the *immutable equality, infinite and eternal harmony* of all the perfections of the Divine character, is absurd and dangerously false." P. 150.

These remarks on the equality and harmonious action of all the Divine attributes and perfections are undeniably TRUE; and to the extent that they are true, is every form of Partialism FALSE,—with its everlas-

ting clashing between Justice and Mercy, Holiness and Goodness, the Father and the Sovereign—resulting in the everlasting confusion of God's moral universe, and the severing of the human family, apportioning a part to heaven, and the rest to Hell!

What does the following paragraph imply, but that God's relation to man as Lawgiver, King, and Judge, *detracts just so much* from the amount of happiness that the FATHER is prompted to bestow on the creatures of his benevolent love?—

"All the Divine declarations are alike immutably true; and it is as clearly revealed, that "the Lord (Jehovah) is our judge, the Lord is our lawgiver, the Lord is our king," Isaiah xxxiii. 22, as it is, "Have we not all one Father? hath not one God created us?" Mal. ii. 10. It must, therefore, be undeniably clear, that he sustains the latter relation, in such a sense as to be infinitely impartial and just in the former relation, in governing, judging, and saving men, according to his law as revealed in the Holy Scriptures." P. 151.

All this militates not against the Universalist argument from the paternal love of God; for although God is Lawgiver, King, and Judge, all his laws, government, and judgments are perfectly in accordance with his nature as Father. The Divine Paternity is the prime, original, and immutable relation of God to man: all the other relations are subsequent and subservient to that.

Mr. Power next notices the doctrine attributed to Universalists, that "the suppos-

ed judgments of God, and all human sufferings, are only the *disciplinary chastisements* of a kind father, and all confined to this world." p. 152. Before giving his objections to this doctrine, it may be proper to remark, that we do *not* believe "*all* human sufferings" are "*chastisements*"; and many believe that the sufferings properly termed "chastisements" are not confined to this world. Well, how does he disprove the doctrine of the *disciplinary* nature of chastisement, so often asserted and illustrated in the Bible, and in the history of the world? Thus:

"We will endeavor to intercept this retreat at once, by selecting one example, from among many that might be adduced. "And he smote the men of Beth-she-mesh, because they had looked into the ark of the Lord; even he smote of the people, fifty thousand and three-score and ten men: and the people lamented, because the Lord had smitten many of the people with a great slaughter," 1 Sam. vi, 19.

In this case God acted either, 1. Simply in the character of an indulgent father; or, 2. In the character of a sovereign executive or judge. Should Universalism assert the former, the facts in the case are utterly irreconcilable with his character merely as a father; and the absurdity of the assertion, would be all the refutation it would require. We are therefore compelled to admit the latter; his absolute majesty as a judge, as well as his mercy as a father; and that the Divine will, revealed in the Bible, is the absolute rule by which he dispenses both mercy and judgment to man." Pp. 153-4.

And what does this amount to? Why, one of Mr. Power's overwhelming dilem-

mas: "God acted either, 1. Simply as an indulgent Father; or, 2. As a sovereign Executive or Judge." We say he acted as *both*—Father and Judge; and the judgment was in accordance with the paternal relation. But see what becomes of all that Mr. P. has said about the "*harmony*" of the Divine perfections and relations! It is plainly taught in the above *dilemma*, that whatever is done in accordance with paternal love, is at the *expense and violation* of the divine office of judge or executive; [executioner?] and whatever is done in the character of Judge, is just so much in violation of the claims of the Father. Hence he says "the facts in the case are *utterly irreconcilable* with God's character merely as a Father." But how so, if all his perfections are infinite, and all his relations harmonious in action! According to this reasoning, do not these "FACTS" demonstrate that God is NOT the Father of human spirits? And to this virtual *denial* of the Divine Paternity, does boasting Partialism finally come! But Mr. P. talks of "the absolute majesty of the Judge, AS WELL AS the MERCY of the Father," in the case. If he will tell *what* "*mercy*" was exercised here, according to his notions of the fate of those who were so suddenly cut off, he will accomplish something towards removing the odium properly resting on every form of Partialism for *denying* the infinite, im-

partial; and universal Mercy of God—for denying and ridiculing the words of the Inspired Penman—"The Lord is good unto ALL and his TENDER MERCIES are over ALL his works"—"the tender mercies" of a Father, and not of a cruel Despot, or malevolent and vindictive Tyrant!

Having succeeded to his satisfaction—and he is most easily satisfied with his exploits! —in refuting the argument for the final happiness of all men, founded on the Divine paternal relation and love, Mr. Power closes the chapter in the most self-complacent manner; thus:

"But to meet the portentous consequences which threaten the system, in the facts above glanced at, and in a *virtual abandonment* of the claimed support from from the paternal love of God, Universalism flies to the doctrine of the general resurrection, fancying that it sees the very change provided for, which the facts and arguments render absolutely necessary, in order to save the system from hopeless disgrace and ruin. To that point we follow it." P. 154.

On the preceding page, Mr. P. charged Universalism with "*assuming*" the fact of a change after death; but *falsely*—and by virtual admission on this page, falsely; for he now says it attempts to *prove* such a charge by the doctrine of the resurrection. But let us analyze the sentence. "*Portentous* consequences." Awful to behold!—Should they not be "PORTENTOUS," if unfolded by such a Power! But they "THREAT-

EN the system." Yes, no doubt the system is *threatened!* But we have learned how much importance to attach to Mr. P.'s boasted "threats." "Barking dogs seldom bite." That is not all: Universalism thus "portentously threatened," "virtually ABANDONS its claimed support from the paternal love of God." So readeth Mr. P.'s Logic: When the one hundredth reason, or argument, or proof is stated, the preceding ninety-nine reasons, arguments, or proofs are "*abandoned*"!! But finally; "threatened" with "portentous consequences," and "virtually abandoning" its other supports, "Universalism FLIES"—aye, "flies" before the face of Mr. Power, with his dread array of dilemmas, syllogisms, bombast, and grandiloquence, "in order to save itself from *hopeless disgrace and ruin*"! No wonder it "flies"! But it can not escape; for "to that point Mr. P. *follows* it"! Alas! alas! poor down-trodden, demolished, disgraced, ruined Universalism!—yet mercilessly pursued by its relentless, resistless, syllogistic foe!

CHAPTER X.

THE GENERAL RESURRECTION.

Mr. Power opens the chapter now to be reviewed, in characteristic style: "On the subject of the general resurrection of the body, Universalism has *shrouded* itself in the DEEPEST MYSTICISM." One would think, to read Mr. Power's book,—if any confidence was to be placed in his statements,—that Universalism was as hidden and mystical as a pagan myth; although so many persons are laboring so industriously to make it understoood. In *his* view, they are only laboring to hide and mystify it—like fools, knaves, or madmen!

Our author next proceeds to state the doctrine of the resurrection, as he says Universalists hold it; thus: "In the general resurrection, all human *bodies* will be made alive in Christ, in whom is this pure spirit; [which he says Universalists assert to be an emanation from God, and a part of God, and immortally pure;] then men will return back unto God, as the streams return unto the ocean, and be endlessly happy in God, *not as individuals*, but in the *aggregate*, as a body with Christ their glorious head." Whether Universalists believe all these "human *bodies*," thus raised, are to

make one "*aggregate*" body, like the spirits, Mr. P. does not inform us.

As to the spirit being an emanation from God, a part of God, and immortally pure,—it is true that some Universalists have indulged in some such speculations, as they have in relation to other metaphysical and psychical matters; but this no more makes these speculations a part of the system of Universalism, than the belief in an *ignorant God* is a part of Methodism, because the great Methodist commentator, Dr. Adam Clarke, taught that God was and is ignorant of some things! or than the notion of eternal and irreversible reprobation of human souls, is essential to the doctrine of endless misery, because *some* Partialists believe so.

Consequently, the ten or twelve pages devoted to a refutation of the sentiment held by some Universalists, that the spirit is immortally pure, as a part of God, demand no reply. Individuals may hold various notions on this, and a thousand other subjects; and yet none of them be essential to Universalism, as a system, and much less to the central doctrine of the final holiness and salvation of all men. I can not afford to waste time in replying to arguments so palpably irrelevant.

I would like, however, to refer to some specimens of Mr. Power's mode of proving that Universalism is not true, by proving

the depravity of man's "mind, heart, soul, and spirit," and the character of his biblical interpretation—premising that he understands by these terms, "the immaterial soul, or spirit of man." For instance, he quotes Ps. li. 10: "*Renew* a right spirit with me", to prove that man's immortal soul is depraved! So also Prov. xiv. 29: "He that is hasty of spirit, exalteth folly"; that is, he that is hasty of his immortal soul! Again; Prov. xv. 13: "By sorrow of the heart, the spirit is broken;" that is, by sorrow of the immortal soul, the immortal soul is broken!! And so, Luke ix. 55: "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of"; that is, ye know not what manner of immortal soul ye are of! What a sound expounder of God's Word is Mr. Power!

Among the passages referred to in proof of the natural depravity of the spirit of man, where the word "soul" is used, is Prov. xiii. 2: "The soul of the transgressors shall eat violence"; that is, man's immortal spirit shall eat violence! And Ezek. xviii. 4: "The soul that sinneth, it shall die"; that is, the immortal spirit shall die! Where then is its immortality? But enough of this. Neither the subject nor the arguments require attention, in this connection. I have referred to these simply as examples of the correctness of our author's expositions of Scripture.

Before arriving at the author's examina-

tion of the arguments drawn from the resurrection, as really used by Universalists, we meet with the following sentence: "Man in all things is a debtor to grace; and if he possesses moral excellence, it is the work of *grace wrought in him by the* HOLY SPIRIT, *changing his heart.*" Consequently, man's salvation depends wholly upon God. If the soul is finally and remedilessly damned, it is because God designs, wills, and effects it! Wherein does this differ from old fashioned Calvinism?

We come now to Mr. Power's exposition of Luke xx. 34–36, a passage greatly relied upon in proof of Universalism: "And Jesus answering said unto them, The children of this world marry, and are given in marriage: but they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage: neither can they die any more: for they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection." On this Mr. P. remarks:

"The supposed force of this language of Christ in support of the system, lies, first, in *assuming* the very point which it should have proved; that Christ is here treating of the general resurrection of *all mankind.* But of this there is *no proof;* and on the other hand, there is strong reason for believing the contrary."

To this we reply, that we do *not* "*assume*" that Jesus is speaking of the "res-

urrection of all mankind": we *prove* it; although Mr. P. says "there is *no proof* of it." For the very next verses read: "Now, that the dead are raised, even Moses shewed at the bush, when he called the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. For he is not a God of the dead, but of the living: for ALL LIVE UNTO HIM;" that is, prospectively, and finally, in fact. These words settle that point, at once and forever; and demonstrate that the expression, "They that shall be accounted worthy," etc., does not restrict the resurrection to only a *portion* of mankind.

Speaking of the expression, "are as the angels of God in heaven," and asserting that these words relate not to man's *moral*, but to his *relative* condition in the resurrection, our author says:

"The Divine Savior charges them with ignorance and error. First, ignorance of the Scriptures which teach the *immortality of the soul*, and demonstrates it in the most concise and unanswerable manner. 1. God is not the God of the dead, but of the living. 2. But he is the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. 3. Therefore, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob live; *their souls are immortal*, notwithstanding the death of their bodies.

But, second, ignorance of the power of God, which is as competent to raise *the body* from the dead, as it was to create the body of a man at the first; in view of which, the future existence of man, soul and body, is perfectly reasonable."

Here is Logic, to be sure! So, then, the

Savior, instead of speaking of the "RESURRECTION", is setting forth "the immortality of the soul!" While the Scripture says, "Now, that the dead are RAISED, even Moses showed at the bush," etc., Mr. Power says, Now that the soul is immortal! And as to raising "the *body*,"—that is, *this* material, mortal body,—the Savior says not a word of it. Thus Methodism *alters* and *adds to* the words of Inspiration. Moreover, if all men in the future life, become "AS THE ANGELS OF GOD IN HEAVEN," we may be perfectly satisfied as to their moral condition.

Here follows a paragraph on another expression in this passage:

"But there is one other declaration of our Lord in this discourse, on which the system depends with equal, if not more confidence for support, than any other; namely, "And are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection." In this, as in the former case, the supposed support derived from this language consists in the assumption of the system. *It assumes*, that to be the children of God in *any sense*, is necessarily to constitute such children *holy and happy*. For, let it be admitted, that men may be the children of God in some sense and yet that relation not necessarily constitute them holy and happy; and, with this admission, Universalism must demonstrate, before it can derive any support from this source, that to be the children of God in the sense contemplated in the text, is not to be his children in that very sense which the relation itself does not necessarily imply, i. e., holiness and happiness. But such demonstration can never be made out."

Mr. P. then most uselessly quotes a number of passages, to prove that men may be "children of God," and yet neither holy nor happy; for it *is not true*, as Mr. P. asserts, that Universalism "assumes that to be children of God in *any sense*, is *necessarily* to constitute such children *holy* and *happy*." Universalism is not so utterly demented as that would denote! Suffice it to say here, that *all men* are children of God, in this life; for God is the Father of all, in a primary, actual sense. In a peculiar sense, *Christian believers* are now children of God, by faith, love, and obedience. But in a still higher and heavenlier sense, ALL MEN shall be "the children of God," in the resurrection; so as to be "as the angels of God in heaven."

After declaring that "the licentious and dangerous dogma of the Sadducees, is only exceeded by that of Universalism;" our author furnishes us with the following *characteristic* argument (?)

"Understood in the Universalist sense, Christ not only fails to refute the Sadducean error; but gives license, indirectly, at least, to every error and crime that men may embrace, or commit.

That this charge against the system may not appear more severe than true, we remark, that Jesus Christ, in this discourse, either did, or he did not, intend to teach and support Universalism. If he did, then his true meaning would be as follows: "Although the sadducees may deny the immortality of the soul and the resurrection of the body—

the Scribes and Pharisees may reject the grace of God, and claim heaven on the merit of their own works—the Jews, as a nation, may reject Christ—infidels may reject the Bible—atheists may reject the existence of God—and all men to the latest generation, may follow their example, and live and die in all this error, infidelity, atheism, and crime, and yet be absolutely sure of holiness and happiness in heaven in the resurrection, as if they were now actually in the enjoyment thereof!"

Well, suppose all this, with the omission of the one word "DIE"; and then what? Why, they would be saved, according to Methodism. Then what is all this, but the merest *stuff*, and idle, senseless declamation? Can Mr. P. or any body else see any relevancy or force in such representations of the greatness and enormity of human wickedness—atheism, blasphemy, and all imaginary crimes—as an argument against final universal salvation, when made by a man who believes that some of the very worst of men will be saved? Is such mock-reasoning worthy of a disciple and minister of the Savior of sinners?—What can all this wickedness avail against a man's salvation, in the estimation of a Methodist, whose creed affirms, in the 20th of the Articles of Religion, that "the offering of Christ, once made, is that *perfect* redemption, *propitiation*, AND SATISFACTION for ALL THE SINS of the *whole world*, both *original* and ACTUAL"? Can any sin whatever, or all sins together, hinder any

man's salvation, if the Methodist Discipline teaches sound doctrine?

Mr. Power next examines 1 Cor. xv., which furnishes us with one of the plainest and most incontrovertible arguments for universal salvation, to be found in Scripture. He notices, however, only a few verses of this invaluable chapter; and those not the most essential to the Universalist argument. He admits—and let this be remembered—that the Apostle is speaking of the resurrection of ALL MEN; but asserts that he refers only to the resurrection of *the body*. The whole controversy, then, between him and us, turns on this single question, Does Paul here speak of the resurrection of *the body*, at the period referred to? or does he teach that *something more and greater* is to be accomplished at and by the resurrection?—Mr. P. affirms the former; and we the latter. On the declaration, "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive," sometimes collated by Universalists with the other passage, "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature,"—whether properly or improperly, I will not pretend to say,—Mr. P. thus discourses:

"It would be little less than mere trifling, to spend time in proving that the declaration, "In Christ shall all be made alive," refers *exclusively to the body;* and the life spoken of, to the future state after the resurrection; and that this work of raising *the body* from death, will be accomplished *unconditionally* on all OUR RACE. It only remains,

therefore, to be shown, that the language, "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature," refers to the soul, and takes place in *this life*, on conditions of *faith and obedience*." P. 174.

On the next page, he says that "this connection with Christ must be continued through life, and consummated in heaven on the same conditions, [faith and obedience,] and is a work of sovereign Divine grace, delivering the soul from the power of sin in this world."

I would reply in the first place, that the *body*—this material, mortal body is *not* to rise; and therefore this chapter has no allusion to the resurrection of the body: it is the resurrection of THE MAN, who, with reference to this life, is mortal, and dies; but is to be *raised*, after death, to an incorruptible and immortal blessed state. Paul says of the resurrection—using a very plain and familiar illustration, "That which thou sowest, thou sowest *not* that body that *shall be*, but bare grain; . . . . but God GIVETH it a body as it hath *pleased* HIM." 1 Cor. xv. 37, 38. And in 2 Cor. v. 1–4, he says, "For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. For in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven: if so be that being clothed we shall not be found naked. For we that are in this tab-

ernacle do groan, being burdened: not for that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life." It is here plainly taught that "the building of God," to be possessed hereafter, is not the "earthly house of our tabernacle which is to be *dissolved*"; that, with reference to this life, we become "*unclothed*," at death, only to "be *clothed upon* with our house from heaven"—not the same, but another house. Besides, Paul says—1 Cor. xv. 46, speaking of the future body, as contrasted with the present body, "That was not *first* which is spiritual, but that which is *natural*, and AFTERWARD that which is spiritual." Both are not identical; but one is possessed *after* the other. Consequently, the resurrection-body *is not* the present, material, physical, mortal body; but *another*, and far different from it. Then Mr. P.'s exposition of 1 Cor. xv. is a perversion of the Apostle's meaning.

In the next place, even if Paul does there speak of the resurrection of this body, it is not "*exclusively*" of that, as Mr. P. affirms. For, what imaginable sense is there in saying that *bodies*, merely, are "made alive *in Christ?*" Besides, can we imagine the Apostle to devote the largest account of the resurrection, in all the Word of God, to a discussion of the nature of the *body*, hereafter, and say not a word of our *moral* condition? dwell "exclusively" on the

mere "tabernacle" of the man, and not intimate a single thing concerning the real condition of THE MAN? for the *body* is not the *man*. Moreover, the question asked in verse 35, and then answered, is not, How is the body raised? but, "How are THE DEAD raised up? and WITH *what* body do they come?" Therefore, he speaks not of the body, "*exclusively*"; but of man's future essential condition, and *also* of the body that shall be "*given*" to him. In addition to all this,—waiving all other reasons, now,—the following passage demonstrates, beyond all cavil or doubt, that the Apostle is speaking of *something more* than the resurrection of the body, or rather of the body then to be *bestowed* upon immortal man: "Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. For he hath put all things under his feet. But when he saith, all things are put under him it is manifest that he is excepted, which did put all things under him. And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all." 1 Cor. xv. 24–28.

Here is the putting down of all *rule, of*

all authority and power, opposed to the rule of Christ; the destruction of every *enemy* of man, even to *the last*; the SUBJECTION of all to Christ, that God, who is Light and Love, may be ALL IN ALL! Does this relate "*exclusively to* THE BODY"? Every body will answer, No—most emphatically, No! The passage evidently not only relates to the resurrection of all mankind to an immortal state of existence; but proves the happy moral condition of all mankind—"made alive IN CHRIST," SUBDUED to Him, and the ever blessed and ever blessing Father "all IN ALL!"—for, let it be remembered that Mr. Power *admits*, what the passage plainly asserts, that the change here spoken of "will be accomplished *unconditionally* on ALL OUR RACE."

One remark on another notion advanced by Mr. P. in the above extract, and we pass to other topics. He says that "faith and obedience" are essential to being "in Christ," in this life, and that this connection must be formed *here* in order to happiness *hereafter*. This at once, and most summarily, excludes ALL pagans, idiots, and infants from heaven and salvation!—for they do not, and CAN NOT believe and obey, in this life. Now listen again to Paul:—"For as in Adam ALL die, *even so* IN CHRIST shall ALL be made alive!"

On verses 42–44, our author thus discourses:

"The incorruption, glory, power, and spirituality of the resurrection body, as described by the apostle, are considered by Universalism to be wholly incompatible with the above view, and are claimed in proof, little less than demonstration, of the unconditional happiness and glory of all mankind in heaven. We have heard Universalists say, "they had very little concern about the soul, while they had such a complete salvation for the body."

Waiving the fact, that there is reason to believe this to be a description of the state of the righteous in the resurrection, we meet the supposed formidable position on the ground of the system's own choice. It will not be denied, we presume, that the apostle strikingly contrasts the natural weakness, dishonor, and corruption of this present, dying body. Now, the whole strength of this Scripture, in its supposed support of Universalism, lies in assuming that those qualities of the resurrection body are moral qualities; and constitute the body, *in the abstract*, morally holy, and consequently, a fit subject for happiness in heaven. But of this assumption, so vital to the system, there is not only no proof, but, as we conceive, abundant evidence to the contrary. The system may be safely challenged, to adduce a single text in the Divine record, where moral holiness, in the proper use of the term, is ever applied *to the body simply*, when separated from the soul; and, in the absence of all evidence on the one hand, we have, on the other, the most indisputable matters of fact."

Now, suppose we grant all this,—for the paragraph concludes with a most safe "challenge;"—suppose it *is only the body* that becomes thus "immortal, *incorruptible*, SPIRITUAL, and GLORIOUS;" what then? Is it to be believed or imagined, that God will put a corrupt, licentious, depraved,

atheistic, blaspheming, abominable SOUL into such a body? No! a thousand times, No! For listen to the Apostle: "Corruption DOTH NOT inherit incorruption!" This simple inspired declaration settles that question, and refutes that most absurd of all absurd notions, at once and forever; to say nothing of the other declarations, that at this period all shall be "subdued" to the Savior, and "God be all in all." Are only the *bodies* to be thus "subdued," and God be thus "ALL only in all" BODIES? Every body must admit that the author of the "Exposition of Universalism," is a most wonderful Expounder of Scripture!

We come down now towards the close of this chapter, where we find the following paragraph:

"'Then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory.'—What death? Most unquestionably, *temporal* death—the death of the body; for no other death than that of the body in this world, and no other immortality than that of the resurrection body in the future world, are the subjects of the apostle's inquiry in this place—leaving the moral condition of the soul, as clearly declared, and fully settled, in other portions of Divine revelation."

Mr. Power has once or twice before declared, and truly, that the Apostle is speaking of "*temporal* death," in this chapter; as on these words, "As in Adam all die." Then what becomes of the Partialist notion, that, when God said to Adam, "In

the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely *die*," he meant "death temporal, death *spiritual*, and death ETERNAL?" But let us quote two or three verses here that Mr. P. *omits*. We can then see whether the Apostle does not here allude to man's "*moral condition*," as well as to his entrance upon that state where he shall die no more: "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? The sting of death is sin; and the strength of sin is the law. But thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ." Verses 55–57. Not only is death "destroyed," as man's "last enemy," and "swallowed up in victory;" but "the STING of death" shall no longer exist. And what is "the sting of death"? It is SIN. Consequently, beyond the resurrection—the resurrection of all mankind, there shall be NO SIN. Will not this affect, most blessedly affect, man's "moral condition"? The fact is too plain to be denied, or even doubted. This passage, with the whole train of the Apostle's doctrine and argument, utterly and forever explodes the idle notion, invented in order to evade the force of this important chapter, that the Apostle is speaking "exclusively of the resurrection of the body," without reference to our future "moral condition." It is as plainly taught as human language can express it, that ALL MEN shall hereafter enter upon an immor-

tal, incorruptible, spiritual, glorious, sinless state, bearing "the image of the heavenly Jesus," free from all enemies and all pain, become "as the angels of God in heaven," "children of God" in a higher and nearer sense than here; so that "God shall be all in all!" Glorious consummation! Blessed result of the reign of Jesus! Most sublime faith and most joyous hope! Heavenly state! Thrice-blessed eternity! Well worthy of God and of his Son!! As far superior to the dogma of the endless reign of sin, death, and woe, as the Christian Heaven is to the pagan Hell!

Taking leave of the 15th chapter of 1 Cor., and of Mr. Power's futile attempt to wrest it out of our hands, we come to the following passage; on which I wish to make a remark or two:

"Here we might leave this subject; but we are not done with Universalism on this point. For the sake of argument, let all be granted that may be claimed for the human body in the resurrection; and the question still recurs, Does this meet the moral condition of the souls that have gone, and may yet go into eternity, unholy and unfit for the holiness of God and heaven? To this, enlightened honesty can but answer in the negative; for, whatever may be the constitution or character of the body in the resurrection, it is the result and work of omnipotent power, changing it from a natural to a spiritual, from a mortal to an immortal body; and this work of Divine power must take place after death, and necessarily in the future world. This is clearly the doctrine of the Bible in the case. The change necessary in the soul, to

prepare it to enjoy God, is *wrought by Divine grace* changing it from darkness to light, the power of Satan to God, from sin to holiness; and this work of the grace of God is performed on the soul alone upon the condition of *faith in Jesus Christ*, and therefore *must of necessity* be effected, *if at all* IN THIS WORLD; and no change that *the body* can be the subject of, can possibly meet the moral necessities of the immortal soul."

Here the common doctrine is plainly asserted, that men must be fitted *in this world* for the happiness of the immortal state, and is performed only on condition of "*faith in Christ*;"—and moreover, that this preparation depends on the exercise of God's grace, and not on the sinner himself. So that if men are saved, it is by God's will and work; and if damned, it is by God's will and neglect!

Well, do Pagans have "faith in Christ"? No. Then they will all go to Hell! Not one dies fit for heaven—*not a soul!* They live and die in the moral darkness, where God leaves them; *and so* shall suffer endless and inconceivable torments! Do idiots, fools, and madmen have "faith in Christ"? No; nor can they. Then they die, and we know they die, unfit for heaven. What then? Why, they must all go to Hell! Do infants have faith in Christ? Of course they can not have; and Partialism teaches the beautiful and sublime doctrine that they are originally, naturally, and totally depraved. Suppose they die so?—

Are they fit for heaven? No. Then their doom must be that of all pagans, all idiots, and sinners of all imaginable grades—*all* sinners, except those whom God designs to save by grace!—for, says Mr. Power, the preparation must be effected *in this world*, and effected by God. And this is Methodism, that is to be preferred to Universalism!

Our author then adds, in characteristic style:

"With these solemn facts so clearly before us, and in the *entire absence of all promise or provision for the soul's moral change after death*, as far as the Bible is concerned, for any man to anticipate such a change under such circumstances, merely because God has promised to change the body in the resurrection, from mortality to immortality, is so far from being the dictate of enlightened reason, and humble, authorized faith, that it is emphatically the work of a desperately darkened understanding, or a presumptuous infidelity, that sets at defiance God's word in the premises, and dares to constitute itself the arbiter of man's destiny in the awful future."

"No moral change after death." The blind idolater, dying an idolater, must be an idolater forever. I wonder what idol he will worship in Hell! The raving maniac, or natural fool, dying so, will remain so to all eternity. I wonder who will keep the mad houses there! The infant dying in infancy, and having *no moral character*, good or bad, or *depraved*, as Orthodoxy asserts, will remain so forever! The man

who dies an atheist, will remain an atheist in eternity. Even Hell will not be able to make him believe in God! Perhaps a belief in the Devil will suffice for him then! The man who dies drunk, will remain drunk forever. I wonder if he will need to drink there, in order to *keep* drunk? And if so who will keep Hell's grog shops!—for let it be remembered, Partialism makes the future *just like this life*, in all essential particulars, except its duration. The Roman Catholic will be a Roman Catholic forever, the Baptist a Baptist, the Methodist a Methodist, and Mr Power will forever be the Expounder of Universalism. I wonder how they will dwell together in peace, and who will print Mr. Power's "Expositions!" O! what utter and immeasurable folly to talk about *no change after death!*—thus making the future only a transcript of the present immortalized—just transferring men from a temporary, to an eternal stage of action, unchanged—neither altogether good nor altogether bad—the saints imperfect, and damned possessing some good qualities—heaven not entirely heaven, and Hell not quite Hell! Such is Eternity, if, as Orthodoxy says, there is no change after death—Time and this world immortalized!

We are now prepared to examine what Mr. Power calls his "direct proofs" that some persons will "be the subjects of endless perdition and moral death," after the

resurrection. These are Dan. xii. 2, John v. 28, 29, and Acts xxiv. 15, 16. On the first named passage, our author says:

"And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." Dan. xii, 2. Universalism tries to escape the force of this testimony, by confining the entire prophecy of Daniel, in its accomplishment, to the days of the Redeemer on earth—his judgments in the destruction of Jerusalem—and the establishment of his Gospel kingdom during the lifetime of the apostles; and as a necessary consequence, the resurrection spoken of was figurative, and not real, literal." Pp. 181-2.

He then adds, most suicidally for his argument, "That this prophecy *includes those events will not be denied.*" Well, if includes and relates to "*those* events," how in the name of wonder can it include the resurrection to immortality? This admission is enough to nullify the whole strength of Mr. P.'s argument drawn from this passage. He then quotes from other parts of the Book of Daniel and among others, chap. vii. 14: "I saw in the night visions, and behold one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his

kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." He then adds:

"From these, which are only a few of the numerous declarations of the prophet to the same effect, it is seen, with a clearness that may defy skepticism, that those predictions, so far from TERMINATING in the days of Christ and his apostles on earth, only COMMENCE a sublime scene of providence and grace, which has been spreading, and will continue and increase, till in its majestic triumphs it encompass the habitable earth; and will only have its *final consummation* in the future and endless world."

With these admissions, references, and proofs, we are ready and able to demonstrate that Dan. xii. 2, has no allusion to the resurrection of the literally, naturally dead to an immortal state; but is to be understood in a metaphorical sense, and has been already fulfilled.

And, 1. The first verse of this chapter—the verse immediately preceding the text, reads thus: "And *at that time* shall Michael stand up, the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people; and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time: and at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book." This evidently relates to the period of the establishment of the Gospel kingdom. And by referring to Matt. xxiv. 21—"For then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever

shall be,"—which refers to the passage in Daniel, it will be seen that the time of the fulfillment of this prophecy was when the disciples were to "flee into the mountains," and "pray that their flight might not be in the winter or on the Sabbath day;" and when the "elect" were to be "saved," by the shortening of those evil days, from the dreadful calamities there foretold.

2. The answer to the question *when* those things were to be fulfilled, is distinctly given in verse 7, of the same chapter: "And I heard the man clothed in linen, which was upon the waters of the river, when he held up his right hand and his left hand unto heaven, and swear by him that liveth forever, that it shall be for a time, times, and an half; and when he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people, ALL THESE THINGS SHALL BE FULFILLED." Is not the "power of the holy people scattered"? Was it not done 1800 years ago? Then, if the Prophet's words are true, all those things have been fulfilled.—Consequently, the passage does not relate to the resurrection to immortality.

3. This resurrection, according to the passages referred to by Mr. Power, was to occur at the time the kingdom was "GIVEN" to the Son of man. *Therefore*, by moral demonstration, this resurrection in Daniel is not the same as the one in 1 Cor. XV.; for at *that* resurrection, "the kingdom is to be

DELIVERED UP to God, even the Father." It is to be remarked, too, that the object for which this kingdom was given to the Son of man, was "that ALL people, nations, and languages might be brought to serve him;" which 1 Cor. xv., already discussed, proves will be accomplished before the kingdom shall be delivered up to the Father. Where, then, will be those to endure "shame and everlasting contempt"?

4. If this passage is literally understood, it proves the resurrection of this material, mortal body—the body made of dust; which is directly contrary to Scripture, as already proved. These objections will be strengthened and increased when we come to examine John v. 28, 29. Both passages evidently and confessedly relate to the same subject, and the same period; and the correct exposition of one will be the proper exposition of the other. As the last named passage is oftenest quoted, we will now give our most careful attention to that, and Mr. P.'s argument founded on it.

The passage reads thus: "Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." Mr. P. then attempts to ridicule our exposition of the passage, in the following elegant manner:

"Universalism attributes sentiments of consummate confusion and folly to the Lord Jesus Christ, by making him teach the doctrine of a figurative resurrection in this place. The following must be a fair exposition of his honest meaning, on Universalist principles. "The hour is coming, in the which all that are in the (figurative) graves (of moral, figurative death) shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; (from their figurative graves of figurative death;) they that have done (figurative) good, (in their figurative graves of figurative death,) unto the (figurative) resurrection of (figurative) life; and they that have done (figurative) evil, (in their figurative graves of figurative death,) unto the (figurative) resurrection of (figurative) damnation."

Now, does Mr. P. really imagine there is any sense in this rhodomontade? Will he honestly affirm that he really believes this to be a fair representation of our views of this passage? Does he think this a fair and honorable and honest mode of opposing what he even esteems to be error? Does he not know that any and every metaphorical passage may be travestied and placed in a ludicrous light in the same manner?—Take the verses immediately preceding the text; which Mr. P. *admits* relates to a *spiritual*, and not to the *literal* resurrection:—"Verily, verily, I say unto you, the (figurative) hour is (figuratively) coming, and now is, when the (figurative) dead shall (figuratively) hear the (figurative) voice of the (figurative) Son of God, and they that (figuratively) hear shall (figuratively) live!" Now if his is a fair and honest representa-

tion of our exposition of the 28th and 29th verses, the above is a fair representation of his interpretation of the 25th verse. What an abomination in the sight of God and man, is such a treatment of the Scriptures! After giving just such a version of Dan. xii. 2, he says:

"If the prophet is speaking of figurative, and not real, transaction, the above is *a perfectly fair exposition of his true meaning;* but such interpretation would destroy, not only all real life, obedience, usefulness, reformation, and holiness, but all reason and common sense. And before Universalism can escape the force of this testimony, it must not only contradict matters of fact, with regard to the time of the fulfillment of Daniel's predictions, and the prophet himself; but it must pollute the lips of this holy man of God, by attributing to him this consummate folly—exquisite nonsense." P. 183–4.

And yet, after saying this, Mr. P. expects to go to heaven, while Universalists shall go to Hell!! If moral dishonesty or unfairness is any bar to final salvation, Mr. P. ought to tremble for himself!

That John v. 28, 29, is not a description of the resurrection of the naturally dead to the immortal state, but relates rather to a change of *moral condition*, to be experienced in this life, and set forth in *figurative language*, will be evident from the following considerations, in addition to those named in exposition of Dan. xii. 2.:

1. The Savior speaks only of those "in their *graves*." Now, all the naturally dead were never placed in graves, or tombs; for

the word signifies that; and is not *Hades*, the word commonly used to express the state of the dead. Hence, if he here speaks of the literal resurrection, none are included but those "in their graves." Those who have been burned to ashes, or drowned in the sea, or whose dust has been scattered from their tombs, shall not experience this resurrection!

2. It is only the material, physical, mortal, corruptible *body*, that is placed in the grave, where it is utterly dissolved—where corruption and worms feed upon it, and that afterwards enters into the composition of vegetables and trees, and perhaps of animals, and of other men; and *that* body is not to experience a resurrection; for Paul says, "Thou *sowest* NOT that body that shall be; . . . . but God *giveth* it a body as it hath pleased him." 1 Cor. xv.

3. The Savior speaks of those only "who have *done good, or done evil.*" Consequently, the resurrection is not to be experienced by the myriads on myriads who die before they are capable of doing either "good *or* evil"—thus settling the doom of all who die in infancy in annihilation or eternal sleep!—for certainly none are to be raised *to this resurrection*, except those who have done either "good or evil."

4. This resurrection, either to "life" or to "damnation," was suspended on what was "DONE"; whereas Partialism teaches

that the future life or damnation is suspended on the moral state of the soul at the *moment of death*. The following extract from p. 188 of Mr. P.'s book, is to the point here:

"And as he promises spiritual life by the power of grace to none but such as believed, so, also in the exertion of his omnipotent power in the resurrection of the body, the same principle will be observed; they that have done good, have believed and obeyed, shall come forth to the resurrection of life—endless happiness in heaven. But they that have done evil, lived and *died* in unbelief and sin, shall come forth to the resurrection of damnation—shall go away into everlasting punishment."

What though they *have* "done good, have believed and obeyed," for seventy years, and yet *die* wrong, where is the "resurrection to life"? And what though they have "done evil" for a hundred years, and *die* right, where is the resurrection to damnation"? The Savior here says not a word about DYING thus or so, as fixing these different states;—therefore his language is misunderstood by Partialists; and he is not speaking of the final universal resurrection, or else their views of it are totally erroneous. If the passage relates to the literal resurrection, the first principles of Partialism are false; and if it does not, then Partialists misunderstand it.

5. The context denotes that the Savior is speaking of a change in the *moral condition* of men, by the resurrection from the

"graves." Verses 24 and 25 read thus:—"Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life. Verily, verily, I say unto you, The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God: and they that hear shall live." Those that were represented as "dead," and "in their graves," were to hear the voice of the Son of God, or the Gospel, and should come forth; those that believed and obeyed it, were to enjoy the life of the Gospel kingdom; while those who rejected it, were to suffer condemnation or damnation. This condition and change are well represented by the parable of the ten virgins, in Matt. xxv. 1–13, which relates to the same subject and the same period, "While the bridegroom tarried, they ALL *slumbered and slept*"—both the wise and the foolish. But when, "*at midnight*, there was a cry made, Behold! the bridegroom cometh," some were ready to go in to the marriage; but the others were condemned to be excluded.

6. That this metaphorical interpretation of the word "*graves*," is admissible, and according to Scripture usage, may be seen by Ezek. xxxvii. 12–14; where the Prophet foretells the deliverance of the people of Israel—not naturally dead—from an *evil*

condition, and not from their literal graves: "Therefore prophesy and say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God; Behold, O my people, I will open your GRAVES, and cause you to come up out of your GRAVES, and bring you into the land of Israel. And ye shall know that I am the Lord, when I have opened your GRAVES, O my people, and brought you up out of your GRAVES, and shall put my spirit in you, and ye shall live, and I shall place you in your own land: then shall ye know that I the Lord have spoken it, and performed it, saith the Lord."

7. Finally; in the resurrection of all men to the immortal state, as exhibited in 1 Cor. xv., there is *no damnation* but all are "in Christ," and "God all in all."—Consequently, the text does not relate to that resurrection, but to another, that has been already experienced; and Mr. Power utterly fails in the attempt to turn it against Universalism, or to prove by it the endless perdition of human souls in Hell.

For the same purpose, however, he refers to Acts xxiv. 15, 16; which we will briefly examine. It reads thus: "And have hope towards God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust. And herein do I exercise myself to have always a conscience void of offence toward God, and toward men." I know

not why this passage is supposed to teach the doctrine of suffering after the resurrection, except on the assumption that Paul believed "the unjust" would be *raised* unjust, and consequently miserable. But this is a most unfounded and false assumption, directly opposed to his teaching in 1 Cor. xv. It will be recollected that Paul here declares that he had "HOPE" of the resurrection, both of the "just and the unjust." How could the pious and benevolent Apostle *hope* for the resurrection of the unjust, unless he believed they would become *just?* For what would be the contrary hope?—Why, that the unjust would rise unjust, and remain so forever. Can we believe that Paul thus *hoped* for the endless reign, the eternal perpetuity of sin in God's universe? Can we imagine that the holy Apostle HOPED for the immortalization of atheism, blasphemy, hatred, murder, drunkenness, and every conceivable and abominable crime?—Never! He hoped for the resurrection of the just and the unjust because he believed, as he elsewhere taught, that *all* would be raised "in Christ", sinless, and "as the angels of God in heaven."

The following paragraph expresses one of the prime assumptions on which Orthodoxy rests.

"The Lord Jesus Christ and his divinely inspired servants, concur in establishing the solemn fact, that whatever change may be brought on the body

in the resurrection, it cannot affect the moral condition of the soul; but the *eternal destiny of man will be fixed by the moral character in which he* CLOSES HIS PROBATION IN TIME and entered the future world."

It is here explicitly asserted that "the eternal destiny of man is fixed," not by his *life*, good or bad, or his *general character* during life; but by "the moral character in which he *closes his probation of time*"; that is, at the moment of death. The best saint may *die* a sinner, and go to Hell; and the most abominable sinner may die a saint, and be saved! What then becomes of all the boisterous declamation, indulged in by Mr. Power, and the like of him, about great sinfulness — atheism, blasphemy, piracy, murder, and every imaginable, horrible and unnatural crime? It amounts to just nothing at all; for that does not fix the eternal destiny of the soul; but the moral state in which a man dies;—so that a boy who commits one sin, and is suddenly cut off, is more likely to be damned, than the hoary headed, bloody-handed criminal! This is Partialism, that impudently and unblushingly calls Universalism "the legitimate offspring of the grossest darkness, or the deep disciplined corruption of infidelity!!"

We have now examined all the arguments and proofs, and some things that were neither argument nor proof, in Mr. Power's chapter on "the General Resurrection"; and will submit it to the reader,

whether it is not plainly taught by the Inspired Penman, that the universal resurrection will introduce the whole human race to a blessed and happy immortality? and whether Mr. P. has not utterly failed to prove the opposite doctrine, of the endless perdition of a portion of God's moral offspring, in the life to come? I leave the argument here; but I can not withhold from our readers the closing paragraphs of the chapter, now just reviewed—so perfectly characteristic of the writer, both as to his mind and his moral sense—so elegant, mild, modest, chaste—with so little of that imprudent boastfulness—so charitable, truthful, and fair. I quote without adding a word of comment; for not a word is required. I will only *italicize* a few of the choicest expressions, so as to be more certain of their attracting the admiring attention of the reader:

"Alas, for Universalism! *Compelled* to admit that the world "lieth in wickedness," that men in all possible corruption of heart and life, are daily passing into eternity; and instead of opposing sin of every character, and in all places, and laboring with the Christian church for the reformation and salvation of man in this world, *by its licentious doctrines*, it not only *licenses sin*, but virtually offers *a reward* to wickedness; *wages a relentless war against the whole Christian system*, and promises the rebellious world a perfect antidote in the general resurrection, for all its woes brought on by wickedness, without reformation, faith, obedience, or love to God or man in this world. And when we

have examined its bold pretensions in the light of God's holy word, it stands condemned by evidence as clear as the Bible, and authority as absolute as Jehovah; and instead of saving all mankind in heaven in the resurrection, by legitimate and unavoidable conclusions from its own premises, it absolutely consigns the body in hopeless death, *and confirms the soul in eternal enmity against God*, and leaves both soul and body under the tyranny of *eternal death*. So far, therefore, is it from being a system of universal salvation, that it is really a system of UNIVERSAL HOPELESS DEATH AND ENDLESS DAMNATION.

Reader, thy soul has an eternal interest involved in this weighty subject; peril it not for the love of theory, the pride of opinion, the prejudice of education, or the love of sin; but sacrifice all for the love of truth, and the knowledge of salvation by the remission of sins, and the witness of the Holy Spirit."

CHAPTER XI.

THE SECOND COMING OF CHRIST.

Mr. Power's chapter under this head, opens in the usual modest and truthful style of the author: "Universalism, when MET AND DRIVEN from its positive positions of attack and defense, throws itself upon its negative resources, by denying a future General Judgment and its consequences." Poor Universalism! alas! for thee, when fallen into the hands of such a theologue and theologician as Elder Power!

The chapter on the so-termed Second Coming of Christ is only introductory to the one on the General Judgment, and should not have been separated from it; most of the proofs of the Judgment are connected with that Coming, and the Judgment was confessedly to take place or commence at the Coming spoken of. The two topics should therefore have been discussed together. In this chapter, however, besides discussing the Second Coming of Christ, Mr. Power endeavors to refute the doctrine of *present punishment*. Both of these subjects will therefore now claim our attention.

Mr. Power says, "The real question is, the Second coming of Jesus Christ, to judge

the world in righteousness, and fix the destiny of man for eternity"; and then adds, "To maintain that he *has* THUS *come*, Universalism quotes the following Scriptures," etc. Now this is not true; for Universalism *never* quoted Scripture to prove that Christ "has *thus* come;" that is, "to judge the world, and fix the destiny of man for eternity": We deny that the adjunct, "and *fix the destiny of man* FOR ETERNITY," has any place in this question. That Jesus Christ was to come, and was to judge the world, we *admit;* but that he was then to fix man's eternal destiny, we *deny*. Consequently, Mr. P. is *in error*, (to use a mild term,) when he asserts that Universalism quotes Scripture to prove that he has thus come—to do both these things.

The phrase, "Second Coming," is not found in Scripture; but is generally used to represent that Coming of Christ, frequently alluded to in the New Testament, at which he was to judge mankind according to the Gospel. Universalism affirms that this Coming was not to be a personal, visible appearance of the Savior, but a display of power and glory, in the establishment of his kingdom and reign, and the commencement of his exercise of judgment—an *administration* of judgment, as he reigns, not visibly, but by his Gospel; and that this Coming is *past*. Partialism affirms that the Coming, thus designated as

the Second, is *visible, and personal, and yet future*. And "*this* is the real question," to be discussed in the present chapter.

Mr. P. endeavors, but vainly, to refute the Universalist argument for the *past* Second Coming of Christ, drawn from Matt. xvi. 28, and xxiv. 34; both of which passages he examines in connection with each other. They read thus: "Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom;" and "Verily I say unto you this generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled." Let it be recollected, and it is admitted by Mr. Power, that among the things to be fulfilled within the "generation" spoken of, was this Coming of Christ for judgment, so fully set forth in the 24th and 25th chapters of Matthew. Universalists affirm that, as Christ declared that he was to Come within the *life-time* of some who heard him speak, (Matt. xvi. 28,) and within *that generation*, (Matt. xxiv. 34,) that Coming must necessarily be past, provided the Great Prophet spoke the truth; which we undoubtingly believe. Our author seeks to set aside these proofs, by endeavoring to show that the first named passage does not relate to the *judgment*, and that in the other passage, the word "generation" does not mean the natural life-time of man, but the Jewish *race*, in its whole existence *as* a

race. We will give our readers the benefit of his proofs and arguments:

"Yield these assumptions, [just alluded to as the "assumptions" of Universalism,] and allow that "generation," as here used, refers to the *moral character* and relations of a *nation*, or class of people, as well as to the natural life of an individual, and that the Lord was speaking of more than one event concerning himself, his kingdom, the church, and the world—events that should *commence* in the life-time of those who heard him, and *continue to the end of time;* and these Scriptures are rescued at once from the perversions of Universalism, and are easy of explanation, in perfect harmony with the whole Divine volume, and incontrovertible matters of fact. But let us look at those points in the light of the Holy Scriptures: "For God is in the generation of the righteous." Psalm xiv. 5. "But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should show forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light," 1 Peter ii. 9. Here, all who are called, and obey the call from darkness to light, and thereby show forth the praises of God, are a peculiar, holy, and chosen generation, extending through all time. Proofs to the same point might be greatly extended.

Again: "O generation of vipers, how can ye, being evil, speak good things? for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh. * * * Even so shall it be also unto this wicked generation," Matt. xii, 34-35. "Whosoever, therefore, shall be ashamed of me and my words in this adulterous and sinful generation; of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed when he cometh in the glory of his Father, with the holy angels," Mark viii. 38.—Here, also, those who are "ashamed of Christ and his words"—"being evil"—"adulterous and sinful"—all such, *throughout all time*, constitute the "generation of the wicked."

From this language of the Scriptures, it is seen that "generation" not only means the natural life of a man, but *also a whole race of men;* such as the descendants of Abraham, or the Jews, including their *entire history;* and a whole class of men, having reference to their moral character—such as the wicked, and all sinful men belong to, and constitute the generation of the wicked; the righteous, all pious persons belong to, and constitue the generation of the righteous. These facts destroy the assumption of Universalism on this point; and it only remains to be seen, whether Christ, in the case before us, refers to those facts. Of this, to say the least, there is strong presumptive evidence; for it is a remarkable fact, which should not be overlooked, that when he spoke of what individuals should see before death, he confined this sight, exclusively, to "the Son of man coming in his kingdom"—"the kingdom of God coming with power;" and when he spoke of "all these things being fulfilled"—"till all these things be done," he did not say that some then present should not die till all these things should be consummated; but this "*generation*" shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled—till all be done. This generation, either as it refers to the *Jews as a people*, or to *moral character, or both*, shall not pass away till all of which he had spoken, directly and indirectly, come to pass, though it extend from this *till the end of time; while indeed, one fact*, with its accompanying circumstances and consequences, in this grand train of events, *shall take place during the life time of some who now hear*, they shall live to see it, namely, *my coming in my kingdom*—the kingdom of the Father. This will SOON be accomplished by the direct power of the Holy Spirit, and Christ thereby should come to reign in the kingdom of his grace and providence." Pp. 195-6-7.

On all this, which embraces the substance of Mr. P.'s argument, we would remark,

1. Mr. P. *utterly fails* to show that the word "generation," as here used, signifies a "race of men, in their entire history;" and failing in this, he fails altogether, and his argument falls to the ground; and the Universalist argument remains unrefuted and irrefutable. Now let us examine the passages quoted, and see whether they relate to a whole race of men, and extending throughout all time; for I affirm that the New Testament writers never use the word "generation," in that sense—never once! As to 1 Peter ii. 9—"Ye are a chosen generation," the word here rendered "generation," is *not the word* used by the Savior; but even if it were the same, are we to assume that the Apostle speaks of the whole race of Christians, rather than those whom he addresses—"YE are a chosen generation"? But look at Matt. xii. 34, 35, above quoted—"O! generation of vipers," etc. "So shall it be with this generation." Does the Savior mean to call the "whole Jewish race, in their entire history, and throughout all time," a "generation of VIPERS"?—! So Mark viii. 38, "Whosoever shall be ashamed of me in this adulterous and sinful generation," etc. Does Jesus mean to affirm that "the Jewish race, to the end of time," is an "adulterous and sinful generation"? Does not every body see that he speaks of the generation *then living?* These are among the very passages I should quote to

prove that "generation" does *not* mean a race or nation, in their entire history, throughout all time; but rather the people living at the time. For similar passages, see Matt. xi. 16—"Whereto shall I liken this generation? Matt. xii. 41, 42—"Shall rise in judgment with this generation;" xii. 39—"An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign;" Luke xi. 30, 50—"So shall the Son of man be to this generation;" "the blood of the prophets shall be required of this generation;" xvii. 25—"The Son of man must be rejected of this generation." These are sufficient to settle this question forever; and I challenge Mr. Power, or any body else, to produce a *single passage* from all the New Testament, where "*this generation*" necessarily means what Mr P. understands by the phrase. ONE PASSAGE, and we yield the point: but *without* even one passage, what becomes of Mr. P.'s *assumption*, unfounded and false? and what becomes of his attempt to refute the Universalist argument founded on Matt. xxiv. 34? And what becomes of the notion that the Second Coming of Christ, which was to take place before that "generation should pass away," *is yet future?*—a Coming that Mr. P. most ridiculously calls "his *final Second* Coming;" as if there were a "*second* coming" that was *not final!*—*two* SECOND comings!

2. Mr. P. *denies* that the Coming spoken

of in Matt. xvi. 28,—of which the Great Prophet said, "There be some standing here that shall not *taste of death*, [shall not *die*,] till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom,"—is the coming to *judgment*, and admits that *that* coming is *past*. Now all we have to do is to read the preceding verse, which Mr. P. *omitted*, *neglected*—perhaps *forgot* to quote: "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels; and THEN *he shall reward every man according to his works*." These words demonstrate that the expressions—"this generation shall not pass," and, "there be some standing here which shall not taste of death"—mean the same thing; and these passages together demonstrate that what we denominate the Second Coming of Christ—his Coming to judgment, IS PAST.

3. But Mr. Power virtually *gives up the point*, and yields the whole ground to Universalism, by the following admissions and statements: Of the passage in Matt. xxiv. 34, already quoted, Mr. P. says, "The Lord was speaking of events that should COMMENCE in the lifetime of those who heard him, and *continue* to the end of time." Well, the Second Coming of Christ was among the *first* of those "events." Again; he says, "One fact—the coming of Christ in *his kingdom*—was then SOON to be accomplished—to take place within the lifetime of some who heard him." What more can we ask?

Every thing essential to this question, *is virtually yielded into our hands!* For was not Christ's "COMING in his kingdom"—to use Mr. P.'s own form of expression—*subsequent* to his "Coming in the flesh"—the *next* Coming? Then was it not his SECOND Coming? Moreover, if he then came "IN HIS KINGDOM," as Mr. P. admits, did he not come to JUDGE men? for, is not his judgment contemporaneous with his reign?—to say nothing of the positive assurance in Matt. xvi. 27, 28, that the "Coming" there spoken of, *was* for the purpose of judging or "rewarding every man according to his works." But more definitely on this point, and denoting the *manner* or *character* of that Coming, Mr. P. says—p. 201:

"The only point that remains to be settled here, is, what did the Savior mean by his coming in his kingdom, which was soon to occur, even in the natural life-time of some of those who heard his discourses? And as all must confess, from the facts already adverted to, that *this coming* was not *personal, visible*, and *literal*, and as he himself declares that his kingdom is not of this world, there is no other conclusion that the facts, and the word of God will warrant, than that his coming was *spiritual, to reign by the prevalence of his grace*, and the power of the Holy Spirit, in his spiritual kingdom, the Church, the Zion of God. And as this spiritual kingdom and reign could not be fully established, till all the predictions of the prophets were accomplished in his character and works."

And again, to the same effect, on p. 203:

"In the light of these facts and circumstances, it is perfectly clear that the coming of Jesus Christ in

his kingdom, that was *soon* to succeed his resurrection and ascension to heaven, *was spiritual, and not visible and literal.* Christ himself said, "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation," or outward show, Luke xvii, 20. And Paul says, "For the kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost," Romans xiv. 17."

This is surely enough: we can ask no more. It is not only incontestibly *proved*, but distinctly *admitted*, that the Coming of Christ, next subsequent to his "Coming in the flesh," and consequently his *second* Coming—his Coming in his KINGDOM, [of course to rule and judge the world,] is *already* PAST, and is not, and can not be FUTURE. The enemy is defeated, and retires; and the field is ours—even before the battle is fought!—if the reader will permit an Irishism here. These statements and concessions supersede the necessity of adducing any other proofs or arguments in support of the Universalist view of this subject.

But Mr. Power—not knowing that he has virtually yielded the whole ground of the argument—seeks to prove that the Second Coming of Christ, his Coming to judgment, is *yet future*, by endeavoring to associate the passages that relate to that Coming, with those that speak of a coming at the resurrection of the dead. But this argument is most easily and quickly refuted. Whenever the Sacred Writers speak of a Coming of Christ, at the resurrection, *they say not*

a word about the Judgment; and when they speak about his Coming to judgment, they say not a word about the resurrection. Consequently those are *two* Comings, and not the *same*. We believe in a personal, literal "Coming" of the Savior, at the resurrection, at the CLOSE of his reign and judgment, which COMMENCED when he *received* the kingdom, sat down on the throne, and manifested his power and glory. The *beginning* of his *reign* was not a visible, personal Coming, nor was the beginning of his administration of *judgment*; but the *termination of both* may be connected with such a Coming. It is the so-called Second Coming, that we are discussing; and not any other or subsequent Coming. And that Coming being proved to be *past* all arguments for a General Judgment *yet to come*, founded upon the notion that said Coming is *future*, necessarily falls to the ground: it necessarily follows, too, that the Judgment by Jesus Christ *commenced* some 1800 years ago, and is now in progress. And here we leave this subject, except as it may be incidentally alluded to in the next chapter.

We pass now to the other topic introduced into this chapter—*present punishment*; wherein Mr. P. endeavors to show the necessity of a future judgment, future rewards and punishments, by disproving the doctrine of the punishment of the wicked, in this life. Although this subject properly

belongs to the next chapter, on the General Judgment, but we will give it a passing notice here. I do not propose now to discuss the question of present retribution, at any length; but only to notice Mr. Power's argument; for the doctrine that all punishment is confined to this life, is not essential to the system of Universalism, much less to its central idea of final universal salvation; inasmuch as some Universalists believe that doctrine, while others do not.—Whether the doctrine of *present retribution* be true or false, it does not affect the main question. I shall therefore not discuss the general subject; but simply review that portion of Mr. Power's book.

His principal argument, perhaps his only argument against the doctrine of punishment in this life, is, that sinners do *not know*, do not believe, and will not acknowledge, that they are punished here. We will allow him to state his own argument, and illustrate it:

"For example: take the case of the thousands who live and die in unbelief and wickedness; ask them on the bed of death, if they do not know assuredly, that they have been finally judged, and fully punished for all their sins in this life, and have no kind of danger to apprehend hereafter. They have answered, and they will answer, and that too under circumstances of all others most calculated to prompt to truth and honesty—they will answer, No; if I have been judged and punished for all my sins in this life, I do not know the time when, and the place where, it occurred. I do not, I can not

possibly believe it. Now, from these solemn, dying testimonies, which are but too fearfully multiplied, it follows most conclusively, either, 1. That they have *not* been finally judged and fully punished for all their sins in this world; or, 2. That they have been, and they knew it, but utter a deliberate falsehood in the moment of their death; or, 3. That they have been thus judged and punished; but they did not know it when they died. Universalism, beyond the possibility of escape, must meet one or the other of these positions. If it choose the first, then it unconditionally yields the whole question, and stands condemned out of its own mouth. If the second, it stands condemned for the worse than atheistical licentiousness, of promising the dying, impenitent opposer of God and his law, who employs his last moments in deliberately uttering a bold, blasphemous falsehood in the face of Deity himself, an eternal weight of glory in heaven, the moment he consummates the crime, and expires in the act! If to save existence, and avoid the blasphemy, the system choose the third position, then it admits the charge, that Universalism, to save the doctrine of punishment for sin in this life, traduces and insults the character, government, and administration of God, with all the provisions of the Gospel of Jesus Christ."

To all this, we reply, 1. Men have been so long taught by a false and licentious theology, that sinners are *not* punished in this world, and that, so far as *this life* is concerned, sin brings the most enjoyment, and is only to be avoided on account of a *post mortem* Hell, which, however, can be *escaped*, it is no wonder if sinners cannot frequently see that their sufferings are the consequences and punishment of their sins; for, whatever Mr. P. may teach, or sinners

not confess or know, the Word of Truth is explicit in the solemn assertion—"There is NO PEACE, saith my God, to the wicked; but they are as the *troubled sea*, when it *can not rest*, whose waters cast up mire and dirt."

2. Sinners, punished in this life, *do* often, and I may say generally, know that they are here punished for their sins. Did not Cain, the first murderer and first liar, know it, when he cried out, "My punishment is greater than I can bear?" Did not the Antedeluvians, the Sodomites, Egyptians and Jews know when they were punished? Was not present punishment *known* to be inflicted and endured, when God's Prophet said, "The PUNISHMENT of my people IS GREATER than the punishment of the sin of Sodom!" That sinners ARE punished in this life, is proved by these passages, however often others may not know or confess that they are punished;—and if punished here, why punished hereafter, and *again?* Does God punish men *twice*, for the same sins?

3. Besides all this, it is very likely that men may be punished for their sins, and not know it, with reference to the *moral law*, as well as for violations of natural, physical, or organic laws. Reasoning from analogy, we judge it would be so. God is the author of man's *physical* constitution, and of its natural laws, as well as of his

moral constitution, and its laws; and the man who violates the former is certain to be visited with their proper, legitimate penalties, as well as the man who sins against the moral law. And yet, in the latter case, as in the former, what is endured as a consequence of the transgression, may not be known or believed to be its *punishment*.—How many, for example, entail life-long pains on themselves, or suffer a premature and horrible death, as the consequence of violating some natural, physical, or organic law, and yet not know that it *is* a consequence of that physical sin! Take an illustration: It is well known that many women, foolish and vain women, suffer unnatural pains, ruin their constitution, entail on themselves manifold diseases, of heart, liver, and lungs—dyspepsia, consumption, and finally *death*, by that sin against the law of the human body—TIGHT LACING; and yet thousands, even while enduring all this, and more, do not believe, and will not confess, that it is a consequence of the violation of any natural law—that is, *punishment*. But is it *not* the legitimate punishment for that sin? Now, suppose we take this case, and apply it to Mr. Power's doctrine, dilemma, and boisterous, denunciatory declamation; and see what it amounts to;—remembering that one God is the author of the natural laws to which man is amenable, and of the moral law: Either, 1. Such a woman has

not been judged and punished for the sin here spoken of, in this world; or, 2. She has been, and knew it, but utters a deliberate falsehood in the moment of her death; or, 3. She has been thus judged and punished; but did not know it when she died. The objector to our doctrine, and the author of the above sage argument, must meet either one or the other of these positions. If it choose the first, it directly contradicts a well known *fact*. If the second, it stands condemned for the worse than atheistical licentiousness, of proving the dying, impenitent violator of one of God's natural laws —the laws of her own being, who employs her last moments in deliberately uttering a bold, blasphemous falsehood in the face of Deity himself, an incorruptible and immortal body in the life to come, after she consummates the crime, and expires in the act! If he chooses the third position, he gives up his argument against the doctrine of present punishment, *answers his own foolish objection*, and stultifies himself; or perhaps traduces and insults the character, government, and administration of God, with all the provisions for the preservation of the human body!!

4. Mr. Power does himself ADMIT that Jesus *does* reign over men in this life—*does* now rule in his kingdom of a universal providence—and *does* inflict *judgments* and *punishments* on sinners, in the present state

of existence. Carefully read the following important paragraph, wherein I have *italicised* the words claiming especial attention:

"This Scriptural view of the kingdom, coming, and reign of Christ in this world, is strongly corroborated by facts, and furnishes Scriptural ground of hope to the penitent, the Christian, and the Church; Christ reigns as their glorious mediator in the kingdom of grace, to enlighten, instruct, and pardon the penitent, sanctify the believer, and finally save the faithful and holy in heaven. On the other hand, sinners should fear; for Christ *reigns also in the kingdom of a universal providence*, to restrain, defeat, and confound the malevolent designs, both of individuals and nations, against his children, his Church. As individuals, to alarm their conscience, as in the case of Felix; and if they are incorrigible, TO DESTROY THEM, as in the case of Herod: as nations, to confuse their purposes, and humble their arrogance and pride, as in the case of France; and, if necessary, *to destroy them*, as were the Jews and other nations.

It only remains for us to inquire, whether THESE JUDGMENTS *and punishments*, inflicted on individuals and nations *in this world*, by our Lord, in the administration of his providence, are those of the FINAL judgment; that is, whether under this reign of Christ, sinners are punished in this world, in exact proportion to the number, magnitude, and aggravation of all their sins; and that there is no possible punishment awaiting them in the future world, however impious, profane, and unholy they may be, both in life and death."

As to a "FINAL judgment," after men have been once *judged* and *punished*, as here admitted, the idea is most ridiculous; unless it be impiously said that *mistakes* occurred in the present judgment, which

must be rectified in the *final* judgment—as higher *human* Courts correct the errors of inferior Courts!

Mr. Power has *answered himself*, both as to the Second Coming of Christ, and present punishment; and there we leave him—"alone in his glory!"

I can not close this chapter, however, without urging the reader not to heed the seductive, syren voice of that theological system that represents sin as most promotive of *present happiness*,—although it threatens unutterable Hell torments hereafter, which it pretends to tell the sinner how to *escape*, even after *deserving* them;—but rather listen to God's Word, and believe it, when it declares, in accordance with the experience of the world, that "*there* IS—that is, *now*—NO PEACE *to the wicked*;" while "WISDOM'S ways are ways of *pleasantness*, and all *her* paths are PEACE!"

CHAPTER XII.

THE GENERAL JUDGMENT.

Different significations of the word Judgment—Statement of the two opposite doctrines concerning the General Judgment by Jesus Christ—Objections to the common view of the subject—Review of Mr. Power's Proof-texts and Arguments, with the scripture Proofs of the Universalist doctrine of the Judgment.

Inasmuch as the doctrine of a future General Judgment, to be succeeded by a state of endless happiness or misery, is a most important doctrine, whether true or false, and essential to the system of Orthodoxy, it is proper to examine it with a great deal of care, and investigate it as fully as our space will permit. If the Judgment is yet future, and accompanied and succeeded by the circumstances claimed by the Orthodox, Universalism is of course false; but if the common view be unscriptural and false, the whole system of Partialism falls to the ground. The question is *not*, Whether there *is* a judgment? for that is admitted on all hands; but, *When? where? how?* and what are its *results?*

A few preliminary statements and remarks must precede the direct examination of Mr. Power's chapter on the "Future General Judgment."

1. The words, "judge" and "judgment," have in Scripture, as in common usage, a great variety of significations. Consequently, the *mere use* of one of those words decides nothing as the doctrine in hand; and those persons are widely mistaken, who think the Sacred Writers have the doctrine of a future General Judgment, as held by them, in mind, when they use those words. For instance, Cruden, the Orthodox author of the best English Concordance, gives *seven* meanings to the word "judge"; as, to "try and determine a cause," "rightly to understand and discuss," "to censure rashly," "to rule and govern," "to punish," etc. To the word "judgment," he attaches *nineteen* different significations; and among them, the following: "the sentence or decision of a judge," "remarkable punishments," etc., "*the spiritual government of the world, which is committed by God the Father to Christ the Mediator, and which he manages with a perfect rectitude and equity*," [the General Judgment, as believed in by Universalists,] "the solemn action and trial at the great and last day," [a false assumption, unless by "day" is meant the whole Gospel day,] "justice and equity," "sentiment or opinion," "advice," "the sentence of damnation upon the wicked, and of absolution in favor of the godly," [the grand assumption of Partialism, as to the object of the judgment,] "the Gospel or

kingdom of grace," and several others.—Greenfield, an Orthodox lexicographer, gives as many, and about the same significations to the Greek words, *krino*, *krima*, and *krisis*, commonly rendered "judge," and "judgment," in the New Testament; although frequently by other terms, such as "damnation," "condemnation," and some others. In the midst of these manifold meanings of the term, we must not *assume* any one of them to be the particular meaning in any given passage, without proof.—The mere quoting of a thousand passages where a "judgment" is spoken of, avails nothing, unless it be also shown that they apply to the proposition in hand.

2. The above exhibition of the great variety of meanings attached to the word *judgment*, shows us the origin of a common and wicked misrepresentation of the views and expositions of Universalists, experienced at the hands of Partialists: For instance, the word "judgment" sometimes sets forth the temporal calamities endured by a particular people, at some specified period; as the nation of the Jews, for example. Then our opposers assert that we apply *all* the passages that speak of a judgment, to that nation and period!—a most unjust and wicked falsehood. For this purpose, they will quote different passages, relating confessedly to *other* subjects and other times, and exhibit the ludicrousness

of what they dishonorably allege to be the common Universalist interpretation. Again; the word sometimes denotes the present exercise of judgment, by Jesus Christ, during his reign by the Gospel—as stated by Cruden. Our opposers seek to ridicule this view, by applying it to passages that we never explain in that way, but always otherwise. So of the peculiar sense of the word in Heb. ix. 27—"And as it is appointed unto men once to die, and after this the *judgment;* so Christ," etc.; where it denotes the judgment of *justification*, altogether. On the same principle they might accuse us of teaching that the judgment was *always* a sentence of Justification! It may be stated here, as a remarkable and significant fact, that Mr. Power does not once quote this passage, in all his book, so far as I have observed. I wonder if he gives it up, as being no proof of his doctrine of a future General Judgment?

3. Leaving all other meanings of the word "judgment," and without reference to passages of Scripture that use the term with other significations, the two opposite doctrines of THE GENERAL JUDGMENT, as held by Universalists, and by Partialists, may be stated in the following manner: (1.) Universalists believe that men are judged *in this life;*—some believing that the Judgment is *confined* to this life, and others that it *extends* beyond death, but to terminate

with the delivering up of the kingdom to the Father. With reference to the Judgment by Jesus Christ,—who is Judge as well as King and Savior, by the authority and power of God,—we believe that it is *progressive*, contemporaneous with his *reign*, according to men's *works*, and in accordance with the principles of the Gospel,—not a personal, visible sitting in judgment; but an *administration* of Judgment, similar to his administration of government,—and to *terminate* in the moral *subjection and reconciliation* of all things to God and his Son; when God shall be ALL IN ALL! This is our general doctrine: the proofs will be given hereafter. (2.) Partialists believe that the General Judgment is yet to come; that it will take place after death, and after the resurrection;—although they *profess* to believe that men will then be judged, and their destiny fixed, according to their *deeds;* yet they really believe that the judgment and their immortal destiny will be determined by their *moral state at the moment of death;*—and that the Judgment will be succeeded by, and result in, a state of endless happiness to some, and of endless woe to others. Mr. Power's arguments for this doctrine will be noticed in due time.

4. I shall take the present opportunity of briefly stating and illustrating some of our principal objections to the doctrine of a future General Judgment, as held by Par-

tialists; for this will enable us the more speedily and satisfactorily to answer Mr. Power's arguments, as well as throw more light on the general subject.

(1.) We object to the doctrine of a future General Judgment, as commonly held and taught, because it is in *violation of the analogy of all correct human government*—civil, parental, and other kinds. Under all well managed human governments, the *Judiciary* acts during the *existence and progress* of the government. Who ever knew a Court to be established, only to act at the *close* of a government—at the *winding up* of the affairs of the state or kingdom?—Who ever knew a wise parent, or even a foolish one, to govern his children in that way?—make laws for their conduct, and to be tried for disobedience, and punished and acquitted, only when they should all arrive at the age of twenty one years! Or what school was ever so conducted—with a disregard of the conduct of the pupils, until the period of leaving the school? Any government thus managed—civil, parental, or pedagogical—would be most ridiculously contemptible; and yet Partialism makes that the character of the Divine administration!

In all cases, *immediate trial*, or as soon after the crime is committed as possible, is always best. The *Judiciary* should co-exist with the legislative, or ruling power.—

And this is according to Scripture. Under the Old Dispensation, before the appointment of Jesus as Judge, the Almighty Supreme Ruler not only made and gave laws, but executed justice and judgment *on earth*, and immediately and continually. Thus the Psalmist says, Ps. lviii. 11, "Verily he is a God that JUDGETH—that is now and always—*in the earth*." Again; in Ps. ix. 16, it is said, "The Lord is known by the judgment which he EXECUTETH"—that is, actually and continually. With these statements, accord the *facts* of the Divine administration. We find an illustration in the case of our first parents. *Immediately* after they had sinned, they were tried, sentenced, and punished—their punishment to endure "UNTIL—and *only* until—they should return unto the ground." Gen. iii. 19. So in the case of Cain, the first murderer and the first liar: He was tried and condemned as soon as he sinned, and *immediately* punished; so that he cried out, "My punishment is greater than I can bear!" In neither of these cases, and we may add, in no case, did God wait till the persons were *dead*, and perhaps thousands of years after, before he judged them, and executed the judgment.—His *present* administration of government was *judicial and executive*, as well as *legislative*, as all good human governments should be.

The same principles hold good under the

Divine government, now that Jesus Christ is appointed both King and Judge; for under the New Dispensation, the Son of God rules men and judges them, according to the principles and spirit of the Gospel. To this effect the Savior says—John v. 22, 27, "The Father judgeth no man,—that is, *now*, as he has always heretofore done,—but hath *committed all judgment to the Son*"; "hath given him authority to *execute judgment* also, because he is the Son of man." This fact was before and of old prophesied of; as in Isa. xlii. 1–4: "Behold my servant whom I uphold; mine elect, in whom my soul delighteth; I have put my spirit upon him: he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles. He shall not cry, nor lift up, not cause his voice to be heard in the street. A bruised reed shall he not break, and the smoking flax shall he not quench: he shall bring forth judgment unto truth. He shall not fail nor be discouraged, till he have set judgment in the earth: and the isles shall wait for his law." This passage establishes the correctness of the Universalist doctrine, in at least three particulars: 1. The Judgment by Jesus Christ is on the *earth*—"he shall set judgment in the earth." Consequently, the *literal* interpretation of Rev. xx. is erroneous—representing the judgment throne as *elsewhere* than on the earth. 2. Jesus is Judge at the *same time* he is King: "the isles shall wait for his *law*."

The exercise of the judicial power is not delayed till the giving up of the regal power. 3. The result of this judgment is beneficial: "he shall bring forth judgment unto *truth*," or, "unto *victory*," as the Evangelist quotes it.

The same truths, and this view of the general subject, are confirmed by Isa. ii. 1–5: "And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people: and they shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning hooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." Here we learn that the giving of the "law," and the "judging" are contemporaneous: and that the *result* is beneficial. We shall have occasion again to recur to this point, when we come to answer Mr. P.'s arguments; and we will then add some testimonies from the New Testament. Suffice it to say here, Inasmuch as the common doctrine of the General Judgment, by God or his Son, is in violation of these correct principles and these testimonies of the Sacred Writers, *we reject it as absurd and false.*

(2.) We object to the generally received doctrine, because it destroys the *effectiveness* of the Judgment and punishment, in restraining men from sin. Of course, a judgment would be useless, *in this respect*, after all men were dead, or risen from the dead, and after they would be *allowed* to reform; for Orthodoxy teaches that no man can reform after death, but that all the damned will sin to the utmost, and without restraint, after the Judgment.

(3.) We reject this doctrine, because the Judgment, as thus represented, is of no use for *example;* because it takes place after all men have died—at the winding up of the affairs of this world, and after the habitable earth itself has been destroyed. To whom, then, will it be for an example and a warning? To nobody. For the damned *can not* reform; and it will hardly be seriously pretended that either the saints, the angels, or the inhabitants of other worlds, will require to witness the unutterable torments and woe of human souls, in order to remain holy and loyal!! This doctrine makes the Judgment TOO LATE, either for *restraint*, or for *example to others*. We, therefore, object to it, and maintain the opposite doctrine of a present, progressive Judgment.

(4.) The Divine punishments, succeeding the Judgment, are *remedial*, *reformatory*, according to Scripture. They are *not so*, and can not be so, according to the Partial-

ist doctrine: therefore we reject that doctrine. With endless consequences of evil, this remedial, beneficial result would be absolutely impossible.

(5.) We reject the popular doctrine, because it represents the Judgment as fixing man's eternal destiny according to the state of his mind and heart at the *moment of death;* whereas the Word of God teaches, everywhere, and we believe, that men are judged according to their *deeds*—their actions during life, good and bad. Besides, Orthodoxy really teaches—although it sometimes talks otherwise—that men will be judged, and rewarded or punished, for only *one class* of their actions. If they *die right*, they escape all punishment for their sins.—For instance, Partialists do not believe that David will be judged and punished for committing the two-fold crime of murder and adultery; or that Peter will be hereafter punished for denying his Master, with cursing and oaths; or that Paul will be damned for persecuting the Christians; or that *themselves* will be judged for any of their sins, if they only happen to *die right*. So also, they do not believe that any man, however virtuous and moral through life, will be rewarded for his good actions, if he should happen to *die wrong*. Consequently, although they quote numerous passages that speak of the Judgment as being according to men's *works*, THEY DON'T REALLY BELIEVE

ONE OF THEM!—and we therefore reject their doctrine, as false and contrary to Scripture. The Universalist view of the Judgment, is alone in accordance with all those declaration of Holy Writ.

(6.) We can not receive the doctrine of a future General Judgment, because it represents men as being *judged* AFTER *they are punished.* That sinners ARE punished here, in this world, sometimes at least, is admitted on all hands. Does God *punish* men *before* they are judged?—does he inflict the penalty before the criminal is tried and sentenced? David, for instance, suffered in Hell—the pains of the lowest Hell, in this life. Before he was judged?—! Moreover, Partialism teaches that sinners suffer in an *intermediate* Hell—not Hell "proper"—during the whole period between death and the resurrection. According to this notion, Cain, and the Antediluvians, and the Sodomites, and the Egyptians, and millions of others have been there punished for *four, five, or six thousand years;* and are not judged yet!—and how much longer they shall thus suffer, before the judgment, God only knows!! Paul says in Heb. ii. 2, concerning the whole period of the world's history, up to his time, that "EVERY transgression and disobedience RECEIVED"—that is, had then already received—"a JUST recompense of reward." *Before the Judgment?* Are all these to be *afterwards* judg-

ed, and receive *another* "just," (or unjust,) recompense? And Solomon says, Prov. xi. 31, "Behold, the righteous shall be recompensed in THE EARTH; much more—or assuredly—the wicked and the sinner." Before they are judged? Suppose a civil Court should do so—hang a man, and then try him, and sentence him! Would not every man, woman, and child execrate such a Court as foolish, wicked, unjust, despotic, and an abomination in the sight of God and man! And yet such is the mode of the Divine administration, according to Orthodoxy. If correct, every state, and household, and school should be governed on the same Divine principles! *No!*—we abhor and reject such a doctrine, as essentially, necessarily, and absolutely false and absurd.

(7.) We object to this doctrine, because of its *licentious or demoralizing tendency.* With *endless* consequences of evil succeding this Judgment, there must of necessity be taught a way of *escape;* and this encourages men to the commission of crime. True, Orthodoxy declaims about the inconceivable and unutterable Hell-horrors of the eternal state, which it says sinners *deserve* and *ought to suffer;* yet it points out an easy way of escape—thus denying all *certainty* with regard to enduring merited punishment. Suppose any civil government should be conducted on such principles? Suppose

it should say, If a man murders, he shall hang—UNLESS he gets into a proper frame of mind, before his trial; in which case, he shall escape all punishment! What would be thought of such a government? and what would be the practical *effects* of such a mode of administering human laws? Yet such is the nature and mode of the Divine administration, according to popular theology! We therefore reject it as "evil, and only evil, and that continually."

(8.) Finally; we object to this doctrine, because it represents the Judgment as resulting in the salvation of some of the *worst* of men, without receiving *deserved* punishment, and the damnation of some of the *best* of men, without being rewarded for their good works. For instance, according to this doctrine, the hoary-headed, high-handed, heaven-daring sinner will be raised by the Judgment to heaven, *unpunished*, if he only dies in a proper state of mind and heart; while the venerable good man, who happens to die wrong, or the child who dies suddenly after committing the *first* sin for which he is accountable, will go from the Judgment to endless perdition! In many cases, the murderer, for instance, will rejoice in everlasting glory, having escaped all merited punishment; while his victim, however virtuous, but cut off suddenly without "evangelical" preparation, shall wail in everlasting woe! Can I believe that

such will be the effects and consequences of the Judgment, under the government of a just God? Never! never!!

Having thus stated and illustrated, as succinctly as possible, some of the sufficient and most palpable and plain reasons for *rejecting* the common doctrine of a future General Judgment, we are prepared to examine Mr. Power's reasons for *believing* it. After the foregoing remarks—after such proofs and reasons *against* the doctrine, we may expect to meet and refute all the arguments *for* it, quickly and briefly.

After the very charitable and characteristic remark that the "irreligious"—Universalism and Infidelity, have an especial hatred of the doctrine of a future Judgment, Mr. Power proceeds to *account* for the fact that the doctrine is really believed in the world, and must "have had an origin and author." He aims to refute the idea that it was *invented* by bad men, or by good men, if false, or by good or bad angels; and then says:

"These facts and conclusions leave *no alternative*, but to admit that God is the author of this sublime doctrine of a general judgment and final retribution. Of this, the Bible furnishes ample proof." P. 219.

We are informed that the Mohammedan believes in *nine Hells*. Now, for the reasons urged by Mr. P., we may say that neither good men nor bad men *invented* the

notion; and *therefore* "GOD is the author of it!" Moreover most Pagans, and many professed Christians, perhaps a majority of them, believe in a Hell of *literal fire and flames*. According to Mr. P.'s mode of reasoning, "God is the author" of that notion! Again; many good people, perhaps most men formerly, believed that Hell was in the center of the earth. Is God the author of that vagary? Just as likely, and for the same reasons, as that he is the author of the Partialist doctrine of a General Judgment yet to come. Let Mr. P. account for the existence of these other notions, confessedly false, and he will discover the origin of his own doctrine, as really false.

Mr. Power next forms a trilemma; thus: "1. The Judgment must be past, and *fully consummated*; or, 2. It must be *progressive*, etc.; or 3. It is yet *future*," etc.; and then says:

"Universalism unequivocally denies the last member of this statement, and *is designedly indefinite and obscure* on the two former; and generally vacillates between a past and progressive judgment, as may best suit its convenience for proselyting or debate."

What shall we say of this statement?—I will only call it a *mistake*. Universalism is *not* "designedly indefinite" on this subject; and it is not true, that Universalism ever taught that the Judgment was past, "*and fully consummated*," in the sense we are now speaking of the Judgment. Uni-

versalists are not *fools*, as they would be to assert this, even if they are *knaves*, as the pious Elder frequently insinuates, sometimes positively asserts. He then adds:

"That the general judgment *is past*, and *finally concluded*, is an absurdity so gross, that Universalism resorts to it now with much more reluctancy *than formerly;* and, indeed, it is matter of astonishment, that any one who expects either his good sense, or his honesty, to be respected by community, should ever take the position; and it is hard to resist the conviction that they know better, but resort to it on the assumed credulity, or gross ignorance of the people."

To this, I have only to reply, "Indeed, it is a matter of astonishment, that any one who expects either his good sense, or his honesty, to be respected by community, should ever make such a charge against us; and it is hard to resist the conviction that he knows better, but resorts to it on the assumed credulity or gross ignorance of the people."

Replying to the doctrine of a present, progressive Judgment, and defending the common doctrine, our author says:

"It will not be questioned, that in speaking of the general judgment, God has given it a definite locality—a point that distinguishes it from all other time, and all other acts of the Divine administration. For instance: "He hath appointed *a day* in which he will judge the world." "We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ."—"Every one of us shall give account of himself to God." Indeed language more unequivocal could not have been used to make the final general judg-

ment special and particular, in opposition to time and events generally, than that which has been employed. But when God says, "I have appointed a day in which the world shall be judged," Universalism makes him mean, in absolute opposition to any particular time or period, I have appointed *all time*, from the creation of man to the end of time; this in opposition to all days, is the day of final judgment! And when it is said, "we must appear before the judgment-seat of Christ," "to give account to God," he means the judgment seat of Christ is really *spread over the whole habitable earth;* that every one shall not give account of himself to God, or if he does, he shall not know when or where; and that he shall not receive in the judgment according to the *deeds done in the body;* or if he does, he shall not know, feel, or believe it, as has already been clearly shown."

To this, we reply, 1. The declaration, "He hath appointed a DAY in which he will judge the world," or the phrase, "*day* of judgment," does not denote that that period is yet wholly *future;* for the whole Gospel Dispensation is called a DAY—"the day of salvation"—the day produced by the rising of "the Sun of righteousnes," embracing the whole period of his reign. 2. The passage, "We must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, favors such a notion still less; and the ludicrous idea attributed to Universalists, that "the judgment seat of Christ is *spread over the whole earth*," will be exhibited in its true light, when Mr. P. informs us where the *throne* of Christ now is, from which he reigns over men by the Gospel. 3. Universalism does *not*, as Mr.

P. says, make "*the day*" spoken of, "mean all time," etc.; as we have already shown. 4 We *only*, of all other people, believe that men are "judged according to *the deeds done in the body*": and the passage alluded to, properly translated, reads, "to receive *in the body*"—not *out of* the body, etc.; while Mr. Power, and all the other Partialists, believe that men will be judged, saved or damned, irrespective of the *deeds* of a man's *life*, but according to his *condition* at *death*.

Mr. Power argues also, that, if the Judgment is present and progressive, Christ cannot be called the Judge of the world; for a large portion of men had died before his advent and reign; and says, "It will be wholly *unavailing* for Universalism to assert that men were judged previously to that time by the Father."

I answer, It is *not* "unavailing" to assert that fact; for thus the word of God defines, and explains, and restricts the Judgment by Jesus Christ, as *succeeding* to the judgment by the Father, already illustrated from the Old Testament. For instance, in John v., the Savior says, "The Father *judgeth* no man;—that is now and hereafter;—"but hath committed all judgment to the Son": Of course not the judgment of those already judged of God himself. So also, Acts xvii. 30, 31: "And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now

commandeth all men every where to repent: Because he hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead." This passage demonstrates that the judging of the world by Jesus Christ related to a period *after* the "times of ignorance," and *after* the period denoted by the words, "But NOW commandeth men every to repent."

But one of Mr. Power's main and favorite arguments, embracing an *assumption* that runs throughout this and the preceeding chapter, is thus stated in his own words; and if it can be fairly answered, everything of importance is answered, and the doctrine falls hopelessly and forever:

"Third; the doctrine of a progressive judgment involves an *absolute impossibility*. It has already been shown, that Christ reigns in the kingdom of grace as the one and only mediator between God and men; that he ever liveth to make intercession for us; and if so, he *cannot possibly* be sitting upon the throne, *administering justice in the final judgment and retribution*; for it is not only unsupported by the Bible, and wholly incompatible with the very idea we can form of law and government, but is both morally and naturally impossible, for the same identical person, at the very same time, with reference to any one man, to be his advocate and mediator at the bar, inviting his return to God, offering him all the fullness of Divine grace and mercy, for his reformation and salvation; and precisely at the same point of time be his *final* and inflexible

judge upon the throne, steraly administering the justice of the *final* judgment, and fixing his destiny for the vast future—*the eternal world.* And notwithstanding the impossibility of this in any one man's case, (and the mind cannot conceive of an absurdy of equal magnitude,) Universalism must place the Lord Jesus Christ in this most ridiculous attitude to every member of the human family, in order to sustain a progressive judgment. It follows, therefore, with a conclusiveness and force that the enlightened mind will feel, that Universalism must either, 1. Boldly deny the mediation of Jesus Christ, destroy the reign of grace, and thereby put an end to salvation, and take its stand in common brotherhood with infidelity; or, 2. Yield the point, and admit the impossibility of a progressive judgment; or, 3. Sustain all the consequences and impossibilities as shown above, and thereby insult the common sense of makind; either of which positions must prove alike fatal to the system, and destroy, or strip it of the last vestige of the name of Christianity as taught in the Holy Scriptures."

Entirely disregarding the unauthorized use of the word "final," prefixed to the Judgment, and the unfounded *assumption* that the Judgment is to fix man's destiny "for the eternal world,"—which will be the proper topic for another chapter,—we at once and directly meet the question, Can Jesus Christ be Judge, executing justice and judgment, *at the same time* that he reigns as King on the mediatorial throne?—for Mr. P. admits that Jesus is now King, now reigns, and now has a throne of grace.

I have already quoted several passages of Scripture in proof of an affirmative an-

swer to the above question; particularly Isa. lxii. and ii. Let us now believingly listen to another prophet: "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth." Jer. xxiii. 5. Mark: "a King shall REIGN and prosper, and SHALL EXECUTE JUDGMENT AND JUSTICE IN THE EARTH!" That settles two questions concerning the Judgment by Jesus Christ: 1. The *place*—"ON EARTH"; and 2. That his Judgment is contemporaneous with his reign—a perfect administration of government. To the same effect, see Ps. cx., and Micah iv. 1–4.

Again; in John xii. 31, Jesus says, "Now is the judgment of this world." And John ix. 39, "For judgment am I come into this world." In the Apocalypse—Rev. xiv. 6, 7—describing a vision that was soon to be fulfilled, John says, "And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, saying with a loud voice, Fear God, and give glory to him; for the hour of his judgment is come: and worship him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters." Here one of the truths uttered in the "everlasting Gospel," was that the "hour of God's judgment HAD THEN COME!" In

Matt. xix. 27, 28, and Luke xxii. 25–30, we learn that Jesus appointed his Apostles "a kingdom, as the Father had appointed unto him; in which they should sit on twelve thrones JUDGING the twelve tribes of Israel" —*subordinate* judges, as well as "kings and priests," to promulgate the principles on which men should be judged under the New Dispensation. How could Jesus appoint *them* judges in the Gospel kingdom, unless *he* was Judge in that kingdom? The passage demonstrates that the judgment *goes along with* the sitting on the throne of the kingdom of God.

Finally; there are two or three other passages that ought to settle this question beyond all further dispute or debate. In Dan. vii. 13, 14, we read concerning the bestowment of this kingdom on the Son of man, and the object to be attained, as follows: "I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him.—And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." The kingdom was then GIVEN to the Son that ALL people, nations, and languages might be brought to serve him." Now let us see

what circumstances and events are associated with the reign of Jesus in this kingdom. "I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of days did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool; his throne was like the fiery flame, and his wheels as burning fire. A fiery stream issued and came forth from before him; thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him: THE JUDGMENT WAS SET, AND THE BOOKS WERE OPENED." Dan. vii. 9, 10. When was the judgment set? When *could* it be, unless while Jesus occupied the throne as King? Who ever knew a tribunal of justice and judgment to be set up in a state, kingdom, or commonwealth, at the CLOSE of the government? Now see 1 Cor. xv. 24–28, in order to know what events attend and follow the "*delivering up*" of this kingdom to the Father, from whom it was received—whether THE JUDGMENT takes place then, to be succeeded by a state of endless woe to a part of God's offspring: "Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. For he hath put all things under his feet. But when he saith all things are put under

him, it is manifest that he is excepted which did put all things under him. And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be ALL IN ALL!!" These passages, taken thus in connection, prove beyond all possibility of cavil, that THE JUDGMENT is *progressive, in this world, during the reign of Jesus Christ, and to result in the moral subjection of all things to Christ the King and Savior, that God, who is* LOVE, *may be* ALL IN ALL!!

In the light of these inspired declarations, also, we can readily understand the 24th and 25th chapters of Matthew—the Judgment of the nations by Jesus Christ, while seated "on the throne of his glory," subsequent to the "end of the world"—of that age or dispensation when God the Father "executed judgment in the earth; whereby the righteous were to be "blessed" in the Gospel "kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of the world," while the wicked were to endure the "everlasting—*aionion*—punishment," the punishment peculiar to this *aion*, or age. We can also now understand the 20th chapter of Revelation, and the judgment of "the dead"—not the *literally* dead, while Jesus sits on the "great white throne," and before whose presence the heavens and the earth are metaphorically represented as fleeing away—denoting

the passing away of the Old Dispensation, which was to be succeeded by the New, where Jesus was King and Judge—the New Jerusalem that came down from God out of heaven; and that neither this, nor Matt. xxiv. xxv., can, by any possibility, relate to the resurrection of the dead to the immortal state, as set forth in 1 Cor. xv.; for at *that time*, there is no judgment, no sitting on the throne, and no punishment; but a GIVING UP of the throne and kingdom, the great work of universal salvation being accomplished by the reign, and mediation, and judgment of the Divinely commissioned, and anointed, and empowed Savior; that the Universal Father may be ALL IN ALL!

Mr. Power's main argument being now perfectly and palpably *refuted*, and the common doctrine of a future General Judgment *disproved*, and our own clearly and irrefutably *established*, the remainder of Mr. P.'s chapter may be dispatched in a few pages.

Answering the question, "Where is the necessity of this judgment day, if the final doom of all is fixed at death?" Mr. P. says that their doom is not fixed "*officially*," at death; but they "take their place in the world of spirits according to their moral character, whether it be in the paradise of God, or the abodes of misery," until the day of judgment and trial, as accused persons are kept in jail till tried, and condem-

ned or acquitted. Thus he makes the intermediate state, or *Hades*, a sort of county JAIL, for both the righteous and the wicked! —a truly sublime idea!

Mr. Power argues the necessity or propriety of defending the General Judgment to the period of the close of all this world's affairs, on the ground that men's *influence* for good or evil, extends far down the stream of time, and terminates only with the end of Time; so that it can not be known, till then, what the sentence ought to be. This notion he illustrates with his usual verbose declamation; but the whole force of it is annulled by the simple fact, that the wicked man, whose actions influence thousands after he is dead, may *repent and be saved*, notwithstanding his *post mortem* evil influence; while the good man, whose virtues and piety bless the world, may *die* in an improper state of mind and heart, and be *damned!* Where now is Mr. P.'s reason for postponing the Judgment?

On two or three other pages, our author declaims most bombastically and pathetically about the necessity of a future General Judgment to rectify the inequalities of this life—to send the hard-hearted oppressor to Hell, and raise the down-trodden and oppressed to heaven. But this amounts to nothing; for oftenest the poor, and ignorant, and oppressed, and persecuted—the victims of hate, and malice, and avarice, and revenge,

will sink to perdition, according to the system of Partialism; while frequently the murderer, the oppressor, the persecutor, the tyrant, will ascend to glory, and perhaps witness and exult over the endless torments of their victims in Hell—perhaps hurried there by them ! !

Mr. Power devotes the rest of his chapter on the Judgment to the illustration of the following proposition:

"It will now be seen, that those principles are most clearly recognized by those Scriptures which we will now adduce, in direct proof of the doctrine of a future judgment and retribution. It will also be seen, that the facts and circumstances which the word of God every where connects with the final coming of Jesus Christ to judge the world, are of such a character, that the event can never occur without being matter of universal observation and interest to man, and, consequently, of universal knowledge." P. 234.

We will notice them as briefly as possible:

"1. The Coming of the Lord Jesus Christ, in the final judgment, will be literal, visible, and personal, in the glory of the Father, attended by the holy angels."

It is an unfounded assumption, that this "coming will be *literal, visible and personal;*" for it has been proved that the "coming" in the glory of the Father, for judgment, was to be within the *life-time* of some who heard the Savior speak—within *that* "generation."

"2. By the great sound of a trumpet, the voice of the archangel, and trump of God."

This affords no evidence of its being yet future, unless it be a *literal* "trumpet," that shall be heard by all the world; but this is an unproved assertion.

"3. At his coming to sit in final judgment upon the world, the dead, both the righteous and the unrighteous, the just and the unjust, shall be raised, and the living shall be changed, and appear at the throne of judgment."

This notion has been already disproved; for the Sacred Writers never place the judgment at the resurrection to immortality; but rather show that it *terminates* then, with the close of the Savior's reign, when all are subdued to the Savior, and God "all in all."

"4. When Christ shall come in final judgment, the whole of our race, both good and bad, with the holy and fallen angels, shall appear at his judgment bar."

No more "*personally*," than they are in being ruled or governed by him, as King: no more "personally," than they appear before his regal or mediatorial *throne*.

"5. At the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ in the general judgment, the heavens—the atmosphere and visible heavens—shall pass away with a great noise, (doubtless with the sound of the trump of God, which shall awake the dead,) and the visible earth shall be burned up."

Every passage quoted in proof of this idea, is expressed in language frequently used by the Prophets, by Jesus, and by the

Apostles, to *represent*, metaphorically, changes *on the earth*—in nations, governments, or rulers—civil or ecclesiastical. For examples, see Joel ii. 28–32, with Acts ii. 14–21, Isa. xxxiv. 3, 4, Isa. xiii. 13–15, Isa. xxiv. 16–23, Ezek. xxxii. 7, 8, Matt. xxiv. 29–34, Hag. ii. 6–9, with Heb. vi. 26–29, and many other places. Many of the passages *literally* understood by Mr. P., are *metaphorically* interpreted by some of the most learned of Orthodox critics and commentators.

"6. At the coming of Christ in the last judgment, all mankind shall be judged in righteousness, according to the evidence of their works.

* * * * * *

We might as well multiply proofs on this point, but the above are sufficient fully to sustain the fact, that in the day of judgment, when all must appear before Christ, when and wheresoever it may occur, *every thought, word, and action of man*, both public and private, will be matter of investigation, and will be developed in the judgment, as evidence in fixing his destiny for eternity. This is too plain to be denied, without a total rejection of the record of God in the case."

And yet wonderful to be told! Mr. Power, or any Methodist believes not a word of it! He don't believe that every thought, word, and action of every man will be exposed in the Judgment, to fix his destiny for eternity. He believes man's eternal destiny will be fixed according to his *moral condition at the moment of death!* What has he, or his system, to do with the "WORKS

of *all mankind*," in the Judgment? What a perversion of God's Word, to quote passages that declare that men shall be judged "according to their *works*," in support of *such* a doctrine!

"6. Finally, in the last judgment, at the coming of the Lord, the righteous will be rewarded with eternal life in heaven, and the wicked will be eternally punished."

True, at the Judgment, or during that period, the righteous enjoy what the Scriptures denominate "*eternal life*;" and the Savior says, "THIS is life eternal—that they may KNOW THEE the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast sent." And so the wicked endure what the Bible calls "eternal punishment." Whether this punishment is in the immortal state of existence, is the question to be discussed in the next chapter. A bare *denial* of the *assertion* is all that is called for here.

I cannot conclude this chapter of the Review, without treating the reader with an elegant extract from Mr Power's book—a passage that helps to make up the intellectual, moral, and religious portraiture of our author:

"And now, Universalism has no alternative but either to attack the common sense, the experience, consciousness, and knowledge—the reason and moral honesty of each individual of mankind, of the whole world, and also the Bible, and even the Almighty, or admit that these awfully grand scenes are yet future. And then indeed, while the inspired Paul, by the authority of God, "reasons of

righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come," the unrighteous, licentious, and deeply corrupt "Felix" of Universalism may well "tremble," in view, with all other guilty offenders, of meeting a righteous Judge in a future and coming retribution, Acts xxiv. 25."

Whether Universalism *is* driven to this awful "alternative," the intelligent reader can decide; and with him we unhesitatingly leave the decision as to the sufficiency or insufficiency of the arguments adduced in favor of the doctrine of a future General Judgment,—simply remarking, that, if this doctrine falls, the whole scheme of Partialism falls. So mote it be!

CHAPTER XIII.

ENDLESS PUNISHMENT.

Mr. Power is Mr. Power still. His chapter on "Endless Punishment" opens in characteristic style: "*Unable* to sustain itself on other ground, Universalism *hopes to* ESCAPE by the non-existence of Hell, or a place and state of punishment in the future world,"—as if Universalism were a mere negative system, flying from all positive truth, and resting on a "non-existence"! But its fell foe does not intend to permit it thus to "escape"!

Our author, and Partialists in general, speak of *endless punishment*. We can not consistently, and do seldom use that phrase. It is a palpable solecism—a contradiction in terms. *Punishment* is chastisement, correction—remedial and reformatory; and therefore cannot properly be called *endless*. For this reason, we prefer to use here, as we commonly do, some other expression; as endless misery, or endless woe, or endless suffering, or eternal torments, and such like.

Before examining Mr. Power's arguments in favor of this doctrine, let us look at some of the arguments against it—some reasons for rejecting the horrible idea that human

9. The doctrine makes thousands, aye, millions most miserable while they live,—driving them to despondency, despair, and unutterable wretchedness, and many to madness and suicide. Such a doctrine can not be Gospel Truth; and ought to be scouted from the world.

10. The final perdition of any portion of mankind would demonstrate the *feebleness* of the Savior, the Son of God, by exhibiting his FAILURE to perform what he has undertaken—thus dishonoring him in the sight of God's universe.

11. The endless reign of sin and rebellion would utterly mar God's fair universe, and detract from the glory of God as the Supreme Creator, Father, and Ruler.

12. A Hell of inconceivable and endless suffering would blast the happiness of all glorified spirits; for how could men or angels be happy, knowing their fellow creatures to be enduring ceaseless and remediless agonies? The endless existence of sin and misery could gratify only devils, demons, and infernal spirits.

13. This doctrine immortalizes the Devil, sin, death, and Hell; whereas the Word of God assures us that all these enemies of man shall be DESTROYED, and that all men shall finally become holy and happy.

14. It is opposed to all the purest and holiest desires of all good and benevolent men, as denoted by prayer and labor for

the salvation of the world, by men of all denominations and of all religious opinions. It is contrary to the most godlike and devout aspirations of the sanctified human SOUL.

15. Altogether, it is dishonorable to God, unworthy of his Son, contrary to his Word, derogatory to his Glory, tormenting to man; and is therefore, for all these other reasons, with many more that might be named, utterly false, and should be rejected and opposed by all who love God and revere his Word.

The proofs of such a doctrine, if true, should be abundant, irrefutable, overwhelming; and we are now prepared to see if such is the character of Mr. Power's arguments.

Our author begins with the word HELL; and argues that, because, as he alleges, the Jews understood that word to mean a place of punishment in the future world, the Savior used it in that sense when he addressed the Jews. Of course, this argument applies to the use of the word by the Apostles also. Mr. Power's authority for asserting that the Jews understood the word in that sense, is Josephus; from whose Discourse to the Greeks concerning Hades, he quotes a sentence or two.

To this I reply, in the first place, Josephus, the Jewish historian, never wrote that Discourse. The character of the Discourse

itself, the internal evidence, demonstrates that a Jew never wrote it,—unless it were a converted Jew; and nobody pretends that Josephus became a Christian. The author of that Discourse speaks on this wise: "All men, the just as well as the unjust, shall be brought before God the WORD; for to him hath the Father committed all judgment, and he, to fulfill the will of his Father, shall come as Judge, *whom we call* CHRIST." Is such a writer any authority as to Jewish opinions in the time of Christ?

In the second place, the argument will carry Mr. P. farther than he would like to go. The author of the Discourse concerning Hades, whoever he was, says that the *just* are now confined in Hades, as well as the unjust; although not in the same portion of it. Mr. P. forgot or neglected to tell his readers of that. And then too, it is said in that Discourse, that "Hades is a place *in the world* not regularly finished; a *subterraneous region*, wherein the light of this world does not shine; . . . a place of perpetual darkness." Other parts of the Discourse show that the author was familiar with the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, and understood it literally. Did the Savior and his Apostles use the word Hades, in that sense? Does Mr. P. himself believe they did? I venture to say, *No;* and yet they must, to render the argument of any force. Peter, addressing the

Jews, (Acts ii. 31,) and speaking of Jesus Christ, says, "His soul was not left in Hell" —Hades. Did he mean the same by that word as the *pseudo* Josephus? Paul, speaking of the resurrection, (1 Cor. xv. 55,) exclaims, "O death! where is thy sting? O grave!—Hades, where is thy victory?" Is that the Hell of future misery? And Mr. Power himself, on p. 237 of his book, in quoting Rev. xx. 13, says, "And death and Hell (*the grave*) delivered up the dead," etc. So that, after all, he does not himself believe that Hades is the place of endless misery.

And this is the kind of proof and argument on which Partialism rests!

Besides, after all that he says about the opinions of the Jews, and his quotation from a work falsely attributed to Josephus, and his argument for the like use of the word Hades by the Savior, instead of referring to passages of Scripture where that word is used, he quotes passages that speak of punishment in *Gehenna*. Does he really believe that Hades and Gehenna mean the same thing? or, is his argument a mere semblance, intended to deceive the careless reader? If Gehenna, not Hades, is the word that means Hell, what do all his previous remarks amount to? Nothing—absolutely nothing.

After quoting several passages where the word Gehenna is used, Mr. Power says:

"Now Jesus Christ either did, or he did not, mean by this, literal punishment in this world, *in the literal fire of Gehenna*, or the Valley of Hinnom. If he did not, then the point is yielded; and he must have meant spiritual and mental punishment in the future world, and must have been so understood by the Jews, and they thereby confirmed in their doctrine of future punishment.

But Universalism has to maintain that the punishment *was* LITERAL, *and in this world*. *If so*, those thus threatened were either really in danger of it, or they were not. If they were who was to inflict this punishment? Surely not Christ, and those who believed in him as the Savior. The boldest infidelity would not assert this in the face of all the facts to the contrary. It then follows, if they were really in danger at all, it must have been from among themselves; that the unbelieving Jews would take up these offenders mentioned by the Savior, and burn them in the fires of Gehenna.—But were such the facts in the case? Most assuredly not. And it is utterly impossible that Christ could threaten offenders with punishment from any such source; and to suppose he did, is to make a desperate and reckless effort to save a sinking system, at the sacrifice of the entire character of Jesus Christ for truth and honesty. And the consequeces cannot be changed by asserting, that they were not really in danger; for this will make Christ utter deliberate falsehood, in attempting to alarm their fears, by threatening them with punishment to which he knew they were not all exposed. For it is too plain to require proof, that the Jews had no law to punish men any where, or in any way, for the moral offenses that the Savior here enumerates. This was known to Jesus himself, and perfectly understood by those who heard him; and yet *Universalism makes him say*, in substance and meaning, "Whosoever shall call his brother a fool, and whosoever shall be led into sin by an eye, hand, or foot, shall be in danger of being *literally burned up in*

the fire of Gehenna, or in the Valley of the Son of Hinnom. And ye serpents, (the Pharisees, who possessed the power chiefly, and controlled the affairs, both civil and ecclesiastical, among the Jews at the time,) how can ye escape the damnation of hell? that is, ye shall surely be *literally burned in the Valley of Hinnom*, for your pride and Pharisaism!"

What an utter perversion of truth is here! Universalism does *not* make the Savior say that sinners should be "*literally burned up in the fires of the Valley of Hinnom.*"—Universalism says, on the authority of the Prophets, and of many most eminent Orthodox lexicographers and critics, that the word Gehenna related, *literally*, to the Valley of Hinnom; but, as used in Scripture to denote punishment, it *figuratively represented* the temporal calamities then impending over the Jewish nation,—and *not* a "literal burning up in the Valley of Hinnom." Abundant and explicit proof of this use of the word by the Sacred Writers, may be found in the 19th chapter of Jeremiah. That the word, as used in Scripture, ever means a place of endless misery, is a bald, unproved assumption.

Mr. Power's whole argument rests on this assumption, and on a misrepresentation of the Universalist exposition; and therefore requires no further refutation.

Our author then devotes some nine or ten pages to a tedious, prolix, frigid metaphysical argument against the doctrine of *limited*

punishment in a *post mortem* Hell. Having failed to prove that Hell does denote a place or state of punishment in the future life, his attempt to prove its endlessness demands no attention at our hands,—that is, any proof founded on an admission of any punishment in that state. Time, space, and patience would fail, should I attempt to wade through the verbose twattle, and expose, item by item, its utter worthlessness.

We come now to what our author calls his "direct proof" of the endlessness of punishment. The following paragraph, with another to be given afterwards, embraces all the texts that Mr. P. here relies on as evidence of his doctrine:

"But, before closing this part of our work, we will adduce some direct proof on this point. "Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels. * * * And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal," Matt. xxv, 41, 46.—"Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power," 2 Thess. i, 9. "Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched," Mark ix, 44. That this solemn language has reference to the future and endless condition of men, has already been shown in this investigation, and need not be farther noticed in this place."

"That this language has reference to the *future and endless condition of men*," has NOT "been shown in this investigation." In the chapters on the Second Coming of

Christ, and the Judgment, it was demonstrated that some of these passages CAN NOT possibly relate to the immortal state of existence. Matt. xxv. 41, 46, and 2 Thess. i. 9, refer to that coming of Christ which has been proved to be PAST. Consequently, the "everlasting fire—everlasting punishment—and everlasting destruction" belong to this life, and not to the future. As to Mark ix. 44—"Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched," a reference to Isa. lxvi. 24, and xxxiv. 10, where the same language indisputably relates to punishments in this world, will prove that it can afford no evidence of *post mortem* misery, or of its endlessness.

Our author next examines the meaning of the words, "everlasting—eternal—forever," etc. He says:

"The only point, therefore, to be settled, is, Do the terms, everlasting, for ever, and eternal, when applied to man in his future state, express his unchangeable and endless condition? Universalism, alarmed at the accumulating difficulties, and the impossibility of averting the application of this language of the word of God from the condition of man in the future world, makes a desperate effort to destroy, or at least diminish its force, by concentrating a mass of pseudo-criticism to show that those terms are *necessarily limited in their signification*, and are of no force in settling the endless destiny of man in the future state."

Universalism does NOT attempt "to show that these terms are *necessarily limited in their signification*." It attempts to show,—

and succeeds in the attempt,—that these terms are frequently used in a limited sense, —which Mr. Power *admits;*—and that therefore they are NOT *necessarily* UNLIMITED in their signification—that, of themselves, and by their own force, they do not *prove* the endlessness of anything to which they may be applied. The argument for the endlessness of punishment, founded on the use of these words, is a sheer *assumption*—a taking for granted the very thing that needs to be proved. The Orthodox argument seems to be that, because "everlasting" and kindred words are applied to God, his government, etc., *therefore* they express endlessness when applied to punishment; although they are compelled to admit, and do admit, that they are sometimes used in a *limited*, often in a *very* limited sense. Like this: Because "*vast*" is applied to eternity—"vast eternity," it has the same *unlimited* signification when denoting the extent of a prairie, or ocean—"a vast prairie, a vast ocean." In this manner, and by such Logic, is the doctrine of endless misery PROVED.

But let us see some of our learned author's philological criticisms:

"This is the true position of the system, as is seen by the quotations given above; and this assumption is made in defiance of the most learned authorities in Christendom. For that the *aion* in the original, which is rendered in the New Testament everlasting and eternal, is compounded of *aei* (always,) and *on ewn* (being,) means literally and

properly *always being*, or being *without end, endless*, *is what no one can deny*, but at the peril of his reputation for knowledge or honesty, or both.

Well; what of it? what if *aion* is compounded of *aei*, "always," and *on*, "being"? Mr. Power says it follows that *aion* means "always being, or being without end, endless." I say, *No;* for this *aei* is never once used in the New Testament in the sense of endlessly—*never once!* What then? Why, the composition of this *aion* renders the cause of Partialism no aid; but rather saps its very foundations, so far as the proof of endless misery rests on the use of that word.

After quoting a large number of passages in which "everlasting"—"eternal" is applied to other things besides punishment, in some cases perhaps in the sense of endless, Mr. Power gives us the following paragraph, which embraces the rest of his "direct proofs":

"It has already been shown, that the infinite wisdom of God, in the selection and application of terms to the condition of man in the future world is above all human criticism, and that there is no alternative between blasphemy and submission to the Divine authority in the case; and it only remains to be seen whether the same wisdom applies the same terms to the finally impenitent in the future world, as descriptive of their endless condition, as are applied to the righteous. "But he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation," Mark iii, 29. "To be cast into everlasting fire,"

Matt. xviii, 8. "Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power," 2 Thess. i, 9. "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels. * * * * And these shall go away into everlasting punishment," Matt. xxv, 41, 46. The devil and his angels "He hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day;" with the inhabitants of Sodom are "suffering the vengeance of eternal fire," Jude 6, 7."

With the exception of Mark iii. 29, Matt. xviii. 8, and Jude 6, 7, these are the same passages that were before quoted; and these exceptions add nothing to the argument; for they but repeat the same terms of duration, "eternal—everlasting—never." The case of Sodom, however, demonstrates that the phrases "eternal fire," and "everlasting fire," afford no proof of future and endless misery; for the "eternal fire" that burned up Sodom and Gomorrah, belonged to this world only,—unless it should be said that it relates to eternity, because it was sent down "from the Lord out of *heaven*": at any rate, it came not from *Hell!*

And these are Mr. Power's "direct proofs" of the doctrine of endless misery! On such a foundation is the temple of Partialism erected! This is its base—its pillars—its walls—its all! No wonder it trembles. May it soon crumble and fall, to rise no more!

CHAPTER XIV.

IS UNIVERSALISM INFIDELITY?

Mr. Power says it *is*; and to the proof of this proposition, he devotes his last chapter of twenty seven pages. We will permit him to speak for himself—state his proposition, and give his reasons:

"From the foregoing investigation, some may suppose further animadversions on the system of Universalism unnecessary; but as its infidelity has been more than intimated, before closing we design to show, that this charge has not been made without foundation and reason.

In this we do not mean to be understood as charging Universalism with an open and frank disavowal of the Bible and the Christian system; but we do mean to say, that the legitimate consequences following its cardinal doctrines and positions, contain all the elements, and are but a dangerous modification of infidelity; and whenever its friends and votories shall claim and act on the privileges and liberties which it gives them, it will result in, not only a rejection of the Bible and Christianity, but, also, the government and being of God.

That this is a serious view of the subject, we readily admit, and only ask an honest and unprejudiced hearing of the evidence and arguments by which it is sustained.

1. Universalism, by inevitable consequences, rejects Jesus Christ as the Savior of mankind. 1. By denying to him the means and power of a Savior; and 2. By withholding from him the work of salvation in the case of man."

Does this "evidence and argument" need any refutation Who is so utterly

demented as to believe that "UNIVERSALISM rejects Jesus Christ as the Savior of the world"? And then too, for an Arminian—a man who believes that the Son of Almighty God will FAIL to save the world, to talk about Universalism "denying him the MEANS and POWER of a Savior"! As consistently might an Atheist charge us with believing in no God!

Some five or six pages are devoted to an elaboration of the statement embraced in the following paragraph:

"But the system rejects Jesus Christ, by denying to him all the work of a Savior, and leaving him nothing to do in the salvation of man. Salvation necessarily implies loss, suffering, or danger; and the mind can scarcely conceive of a greater absurdity than to talk of salvation, where there is neither loss, suffering, or danger. As sin is the whole cause of a man needing a Savior, if he is saved by Jesus Christ, that salvation must be either, 1. From the commission or practice of sin; or, 2. From the punishment and consequence of sin in this world; or, 3. From the danger of a future and endless punishment in the world to come."

All this is most easily and summarily disposed of, by a simple statement of facts.—Man's *present condition* is one of sin and suffering, and all must die. By the grace of God, through the Savior Jesus Christ, all men shall be delivered from sin, suffering, and death, by a resurrection to a state of holiness and happiness; or, in the language of an Apostle, "delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious lib-

erty of the children of God." We can now see the justness of the following charitable charge:

"So that, after all its pretended boast of Jesus Christ as a universal Savior, Universalism, like the Inn of Bethlehem in Judea, has no place for Jesus, either on earth or in heaven; no, not even so much as a manger of straw for the glorious Redeemer—God manifest in the flesh."

We come now to our author's second reason for calling Universalism "a modification of Infidelity":

II. In further proof of the infidelity of the system, it, by inevitable consequences, rejects the Holy Ghost as the only Divine agent of man's sanctification and thorough preparation for heaven and glory."

And what does this amount to? Just this: Because a system differs from Methodism and Mr. Power, on the character and office of the Holy Spirit, it must be branded as Infidelity! Do such arguments need any answer?

Mr. Power then says that Universalism "makes the Holy Spirit *any thing or* NOTHING, as may best suit its convenience for the time being." All I have to say to this, is, that the statement is *not true;* and consequently the charge founded upon the untruth, is a slander.

Let us now see the next "proof" of the Infidelity of Universalism:

"The infidelity, of the system is further proved, by its virtually rejecting the Holy Scriptures as a rule of faith and practice; so far, at least, as man's final salvation in heaven is concerned."

To this I reply, Universalism does NOT "reject the Holy Scriptures as a rule of faith and practice": on the contrary, the Bible is our ONLY authoritative rule of faith and practice.

"So far, at least," adds Mr. Power, "as man's final salvation in heaven is concerned." And what does he mean by this? He probably means that, because Universalism differs from Methodism as to the design of the Scriptures—teaching that they *reveal* the "salvation in heaven," rather than bring the means of *securing it*, it is *therefore* Infidelity! Perhaps he means that Universalism is Infidelity, because it does not teach that belief in the Scriptures is essential to salvation in heaven. And does Mr. Power believe such belief to be essential to salvation? If so, he consigns every pagan, every madman, and every fool to perdition! If not so, he answers his own accusation against Universalism.

In proof of the assertion that Universalism is Infidelity, Mr. Power quotes from Jonathan Kidwell's "Philomath Encyclopedia." He might as well have quoted from Tom Paine's "Age of Reason," except that Mr. Kidwell retains the *name* Universalist, although in opposition to the wishes of the great body of Universalists in this country, as expressed in nearly all the leading periodicals of our order. He is generally esteemed to be a Deist, and in some respects,

a Pantheist,—so esteemed by nearly all Universalists, except by a few, or many, whom he happens to control in Indiana, and who control affairs in that State. No honorable man would quote Mr. Kidwell as authority for saying "that UNIVERSALISM rejects the Holy Scriptures as too *inaccurate* to be relied on in *many important facts*." A man might as fairly and honorably refer to the opinions of O. A. Brownson, published just before he left Universalism for Deism, or to those of Abner Kneeland just before he renounced Universalism for Atheism, as authority on the subject of the faith of Universalists, as to Mr. Kidwell's "Encyclopedia." But we confess ourselves but little astonished that Elder Power should make use of such means to prove that "Universalism is Infidelity." We could not well be astonished at anything he might say or do, in opposition to Universalism.

We hasten to our author's next "evidence and argument:"

"Its infidelity is further evinced, by removing all the motives and restraints from the conscience, heart and actions of man, drawn from eternity, and with which the Bible abounds."

The argument is this: Methodism says that the Bible abounds with motives and restraints drawn from *eternity;* and this is denied by Universalism: THEREFORE—most logical conclusion!—Universalism is *Infidelity.*

But let us read a paragraph or two in illustration of this point:

"This cannot fail to strip a civil oath or obligation, which derives its force and authority, principally, *from the responsibilities of eternity*, of all its solemnity and sanctity, paralyze the whole moral sense in man, and circumscribe all motives of action to the narrow sphere of this world, and the brief space of human life; as nothing he can believe or reject, do or omit, can possibly affect his final holiness and happiness in eternity.

Let these *atheistical principles* and dogmas become universally prevalent, and who will care for the sanctity of the Sabbath? for the Bible, religion, or religious institutions; for civil obligations or institutions; for man or his Maker? Universal anarchy would be turned loose in all its horror, to rid the world of such a race."

In answer to all this bombast and idle declamation, I will only ask Mr. Power and his brethren—Do you regard a civil oath, merely because you are afraid of a future and endless Hell? Do you care for the sanctity of the Sabbath, merely because you are afraid of perdition? Have you no real, sincere, hearty love for that day and its exercises? Do you care for the Bible, only because a care for it saves you from final damnation? Have you no sincere love for the Book? Do you care for Religion only as a means of saving you from eternal torments? Do you mock God with such piety as that? Are you good citizens, caring for civil obligations and institutions, merely because of your fear of immortal

woe? Do you care for your Maker,—not because he is your Father, whose nature is Love, and who is good unto all,—but because you are afraid of his wrath, and of the Devil?!

What is your answer, Mr. Power? Do you say, Yes? Then alas! for your piety—all a mere semblance, a mockery! Do you say, No? Then you have no right to so abominably slander universal humanity, as you do in the passage above quoted!

Our author's last "evidence and argument" are thus stated:

"To remove all doubt from the mind that these are legitimate and inevitable consequences, we will demonstrate the infidelity of the system with a clearness that may defy all evasion.

That system which promises man an eternal exemption from all danger of suffering or punishment in the future world, and assures him of an unconditional and infallible admission into eternal happiness in heaven, although he should live and die in the total rejection and blasphemy of the Lord Jesus Christ as the Savior of mankind; the utter rejection of the divinity and sanctifying influences of the Holy Ghost; the absolute rejection of the Holy Scriptures as a rule of faith and practice; the profane rejection of all religion and religious institutions, all moral purity and virtue, all authority both human and Divine; is necessarily and absolutely, in its logical and moral consequences, as directly opposed to the whole scheme of Christianity as revealed in the Bible, as open and undisguised infidelity itself."

Well, what of all this, if the Methodist Creed speaks the truth in the 20th of its

Articles of Religion?—"The offering of Christ once made, is that PERFECT *redemption*, PROPITIATION, AND SATISFACTION for ALL the sins of the WHOLE WORLD, both *original and* ACTUAL."—Why should any man, however abominable a sinner, be endlessly damned, if that is is true? The argument is just this: Universalism teaches that sinners, great sinners, all sinners will finally be saved from sin, and suffering, and death; and is therefore Infidelity. If it taught the salvation of only *some* sinners, it would be Christianity, like Methodism!

But Mr. Power asks Universalism some solemn questions, and demands direct "answers, without evasion or equivocation."—The following is the first:

"Does not the most bold and wicked rejection of the entire character of the Lord Jesus Christ as the Savior of men, persisted in through life, and blasphemously reiterated and adhered to in death, expose the infidel offender to future and endless punishment, or at all endanger his eternal holiness and happiness in heaven after death? Surely no honest man, or honest system, would seek for a moment to evade this question. And yet some Universalists, and Universalism, writhe under it almost as in the agonies of death; several instances of which we have witnessed, but forbear to name them here. Nevertheless, to this point they must come, however reluctant."

Fudge! is the only answer that need be given to the contemptible insinuation, repeated for the thousandth time, or less, that

Universalism tries to *evade* such questions, and *writhes* under them!

To this question, I reply, *No*—of course not. And now let me ask him and all Partialists a few questions: Do the most bold and wicked rejection of the Lord Jesus Christ, blasphemy, and every abominable crime, persisted in till *one hour before death*, endanger a man's final salvation, in case he is converted then, and dies immediately? Every Partialist and Mr. Power will say, No. Then is the magnitude, or number of crimes, or long continuance in them, the cause of a man's damnation? No.—Then what is the cause? The fact of his *dying* a sinner, and not the fact of his sinful character and life. Then is not all the declamation, like the above, with which this chapter and Mr. Power's book abound, the merest *stuff*, calculated to mislead and deceive? Is not the whole objection to Universalism founded on the most palpable fallacy and sophism?

Mr. Power asks several more just such questions, that add nothing to the force of the argument—a mere frothy reiteration of the proof that Universalism is Infidelity, because it teaches the final holiness and salvation of *great* sinners, that *die* sinners.

Near the close of his book, as a grand climax, and overwhelming *finale*, our author represents Universalism as addressing an Atheist on this wise:

"No, sir, you are infinitely mistaken; but your error is perfectly harmless as it regards your future and eternal destiny. You may, indeed, meditate, and as far as possible, consummate the merciless slaughter of all the kings of the earth, with all other civil rulers; you may tear up human society and goveraments from their foundations, and turn anarchy loose, to drive in lawless cruelty over a prostrate world; you may, indeed, martyr the ministers of religion, and cruelly murder the saints of the Most High; you may break down the altars of Christianity, and turn the sanctuaries of God into "heathen temples" and theatres, and pollute them with all possible licentiousness and crime; you may "deride and ridicule" the Son of God as a base "impostor;" you may then even attack the throne of God, blaspheme and deny his existence, set Jehovah at defiance in the face of his own altars; and thus, weary of the work of blasphemy and death, you may turn your diabolical phrenzy upon your own person, and consummate your career of atheism in aggravated suicide. And then, instead of "death being an eternal sleep," you will live, not in suffering or punishment—for there is no punishment in the future, it is all confined to this world—you will live instantly in heaven with the singing millions in God's eternal sanctuary on high. And now, although no one man has meditated or committed all those crimes against God and man, yet they have all been meditated, and, as far as men had the power, the attempt has been made to accomplish the dreadful work; and men have died in the attempt, with hearts filled with malignity and revenge against both God and man, and with hands bathed in innocent blood."

Now, with reference to all such, and all others of lower grades of offenders living and dying in crime, we ask Universalism, and demand a direct answer, Are they received to heaven and eternal happiness, or are they lost in an endless and hopeless hell?"

And what does Methodism say? It says that Jesus Christ has made a "perfect redemption, propitiation and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual." Then why should any sinner be finally and endlessly damned?

It also teaches, and Mr. Power believes, that a man may commit all these, and a thousand other abominable crimes—may live in the deepest, grossest, darkest depravity—a heaven-daring blasphemer and atheist—a very devil, and everything else, bad, monstrous, and infernal, *until one hour before his death*, then go to a revival meeting, "get religion" in a moment, die suddenly, and go to everlasting glory!—and that too, after having enjoyed the *happiness* derived from sin here, without enduring any proper punishment! Now who can tell why Methodism should be called Christianity, and Universalism be branded as Infidelity?

Thus we have, in all their force, and elegance, and conclusiveness, "the evidences and arguments" on which Mr. Power bases his charge that "Universalism is Infidelity." With this most unrighteous slander, he ends his labors—a very proper conclusion of such a work! It is said that a "bad beginning makes a good ending." This old maxim does not hold good in this case. The work had a bad beginning, was badly conducted, and ends as badly.

Rev. John H. Power's "Exposition of Universalism" has now been *reviewed:* whether it has been fully and fairly *answered*, each reader will decide for himself. We leave the work in his hands, with the prayer that it may do good, and subserve the interests of pure Gospel Truth.

May the Lord have mercy on the author of the book just reviewed, and forgive him his many hard and bitter words against Universalists, his manifold perversions and misrepresentation of their doctrines, and all his unfounded charges against the Faith of its advocates! May he repent of his sins, be converted to the Truth, and die in the Faith that he has so violently and wickedly opposed!

CHAPTER XV.

PROOFS OF UNIVERSALISM.

It has been thought advisable to add a supplementary chapter to the Review of Power's "Exposition of Universalism," to embrace some of the principal and plainest evidences of the doctrine which the Methodist Elder so bitterly assails, and so vainly endeavors to refute. It is true that he refers to some of these proofs and arguments; but not to all of them; and even the few which he notices, he fails to answer, as the reader has doubtless already seen. It seems proper, therefore, to conclude this Review, with a brief compendium of the main evidences on which our holy Faith rests, including those already discussed, but more particularly such as have not been introduced into the present controversy.

A statement of the general system of Universalism may not be out of place here; although the point in dispute, is the final salvation of all mankind. Although the great distinguishing peculiarity of our doctrine, yet it is only a part of one great and sublime system of faith. We would state the outlines of this great system thus:

UNIVERSALISM, which we esteem to be synonymous with Christianity, embraces the faith in One God, the Creator of the universe, and the Father of all human spirits; whose nature is Love, and whose attributes are infinite Wisdom, Power, Goodness, Justice, Mercy, and Truth, all unchangeable and immortal; who has spoken to men by Prophets and Angels, but especially by Jesus Christ, his Son, the Messiah, and our Savior, divinely commissioning and empowering him to reign over men as King, and to execute Justice as Judge, during the Gospel Dispensation, and to finally purify and save the whole human race. Universalism teaches that the Bible is the Word of God, a revelation of his Will, and of man's Duty and Destiny—a communication from God to man, given by inspiration, and of Divine authority. It teaches that all men ought to love God supremely, and obey all his commandments, in order to secure the highest happiness; and that sin is righteously and equitably and inevitably punished. Moreover, it teaches the resurrection of all mankind to a state of immortality, holiness, and happiness.

This is but a brief outline of the more prominent and important features of our general system of doctrine. It is not within our province now to prove the truth of all these sentiments; for our attention so far as argument is concerned, is confined

to the question of final universal salvation.

The proofs and arguments noticed by Mr. Power, but unrefuted, are the following: The promise made to Abraham, of blessing all nations in his seed; God's Will for universal salvation; the paternal Love of God; 1 Tim. iv. 10—God the Savior of all men; and Luke 20th, with 1 Cor. 15th, that treat of the resurrection of the dead. These passages and arguments are discussed at some length; but Mr. Power's objections to our views have been met and answered in the preceding pages. Besides the above, the following passages of Scripture are alluded to in Mr. Power's book, and only slightly noticed, more or less: Jesus the light of the world; Ps. ii. 7, 8; Ps. xxii. 27, 28; Isa. xxv., the feast of fat things; Rom. viii. 16–21; Isa. xlv. 22–25; Jesus the Savior of the world; and perhaps a few others.

There are many Scripture proofs and arguments, some of the most important and unequivocal, that Mr. Power does not even name. Our readers are entitled to these; and they shall be given here, as briefly and succinctly as possible, including those already stated and discussed. This is intended as a mere general summary of the clearest evidences of the truth of our great distinguishing doctrine, without enlargement or extended argument. We trust it will be clearly seen that our doctrinal and spiritual

house is founded on a ROCK, and that all efforts to destroy or demolish it, are as vain as the dashing of foam-surges against old ocean's adamantine walls. "To the law and the testimony!"

1. The fact, the undisputed fact of the Universal Paternity of God, is enough to demonstrate the truth of the doctrine of the final happiness of all human intelligences —God's offspring, even if the Bible were as silent as the grave on the subject of man's destiny. I mean that it proves this, where the question is whether all shall be happy, or some endlessly miserable. As a Father, he might by a bare possibility annihilate his children; but could not by any possibility render their existence a ceaseless and remediless curse.

2. God's Love, Benevolence, or Goodness—impartial, universal, unchangeable, and eternal, requires that he render the creatures of his power finally happy; or at least, not forever wretched. The Apostle's sublime declaration, "God is Love," is a truth, as high as heaven, as deep as Hell, as vast as the universe, and as immortal as the Divine Throne, and of itself a sufficient guaranty of the ultimate happiness of all intelligent beings in all the boundless dominions of the Universal Father and Ruler. This Benevolence is declared to be extended to all, even to the evil and unthankful; and is manifested even in punishment, so as

to make it result in the good of the punished. The truth of the universal Goodness of God blazes through all the pages of the Inspired Volume, like the sun through the material heavens, and demonstrates the utter falsity and impiety of the dogma of endless sin and suffering.

3. God's Holiness demands and will secure universal holiness. Whatever of unholiness now exists, is but temporary in duration, and will be overruled for good; so that sin and evil shall not mar God's fair universe forever; as saith the Inspired Word, "The wrath of man shall praise the Lord, and the remainder of wrath he will restrain."

4. The infinite Justice of the righteous Jehovah, forbids the infliction of unjust, vindictive, or useless sufferings or punishments; and requires, if not the happiness of all, at least that the existence of no subject of his creative power should on the whole prove a curse. No man asks for life, or is consulted whether he shall exist; and to expose him to so fearful a destiny, with the knowledge that he would meet it, would be palpably and monstrously unjust. Such injustice is no attribute of the Creator and Father of all.

5. The Divine Wisdom and Power, knowledge and almightiness, guided and controlled by unbounded Love, will secure the universal blessedness which parental

Kindness demands. There can be no failure of the accomplishment of the Divine purposes. Neither sin, nor unbelief, nor death, nor Hell, nor ignorance, nor the Devil, nor all fabled infernal spirits, nor all these opposing powers associated and combined together, can frustrate the philanthropic designs of the omniscient, omnipotent, benevolent God.

6. The Glory of God, as well as the Glory of the Divinely commissioned and anointed Savior, requires the ultimate holiness and happiness of all the human race. As Creator, God will be most glorified, and glorified only, by having his intelligent creatures answer the end and design of their creation; that is, by their ultimate happiness; as saith the Calvinistic Catechism, and saith truly, "The chief end of man is to glorify God and enjoy him forever." For one soul to be endlessly marred and blasted, would detract from the Glory of God. As supreme Ruler, God will be most glorified, by having all his subjects brought to obey him. Endless rebellion and wickedness would diminish the Glory of the Universal King. As the heavenly Father of all, God will be most glorified by having all his intelligent offspring brought to love him supremely, and one another as themselves. Endless hatred in the hearts of men, either toward God or one another, would dim the glory of the Universal Father. As Redeemer and

Savior, God, and Jesus as the Sent of God, will be most glorified by finally redeeming and saving all sinners, and bringing them to a state of fadeless and immortal purity and blessedness. Failure in this, would dishonor the Amighty and Universal Savior; as might be vividly illustrated by Christ's parable of the man that began to build a tower, without counting the cost, and was not able to finish it. The highest Glory of God and of his Son, demands the final happiness of the moral universe.

7. The Design and End of the Judgment, under the reign of God's Messiah, and the remedial Design of Punishment, affords strong testimony for the final holiness and salvation of all men; at the least, they disprove the notion of the endlessness of sin and misery. The object of administering judgment and justice in the earth, is to discipline and reform and benefit God's disobedient children and subjects. This is one of the means used by the Almighty Ruler and Father, to effect his benevolent designs.

8. The promise made to our first mother —"The Seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head"—denotes, though figuratively expressed, the final destruction of all evil, and the source and power of evil.

9. The promise to Abraham, as recorded in Gen. xxii. 15–18, and repeated and referred to in many other places, more clear-

ly sets forth the Divine purpose to finally Bless the whole human family. "And the angel of the Lord called unto Abraham out of heaven the second time, and said, By myself have I sworn, saith the Lord, for because thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy son, thine only son: That in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea shore; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies; and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed; because thou hast obeyed my voice." Gen. xxii. 15–18. This sublime promise, let it be remembered, is confirmed and made sure by the solemn oath of Almighty God: "By myself have I sworn."

10. Another irrefragable evidence of the truth of our distinguishing doctrine is afforded by the Apostle's assurance of final universal Reconciliation, as recorded in Col. i. 19, 20: "For it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell; and, having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself, by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven;" and 2 Cor. v. 18, 19: "And all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation; to wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself,

not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation."—When the sinful, unreconciled world shall be reconciled to God, through Jesus Christ, certainly the world will be saved and happy.

11. The Divine assurances, by Prophet and Apostle, of the ultimate Righteousness of all men, is a demonstrative proof of final universal salvation. This testimony of Inspiration may be found in Isa. xlv. 22–25. "Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth: for I am God, and there is none else. I have sworn by myself, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, That unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear. Surely, shall *one* say, in the Lord have I righteousness and strength: even to him shall men come; and all that are incensed against him shall be ashamed. In the Lord shall all the seed of Israel be justified, and shall glory." Leaving out the *italicized* word "one," added here by the translators, and we have the evidence that ultimately every tongue shall confess righteousness and strength in the Lord. And Rom. v. 18–21. "Therefore, as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sin-

ners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous. Moreover the law entered, that the offence might abound. But where sin abounded, grace did much more abound: That as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord." We are here taught that all sinners, all condemned sinners, shall become righteous; and that Divine grace shall abound more than sin;—which can not be true, if sin shall reign in the souls of men. of one man, and mar God's moral universe forever. Universal Righteousness will secure universal salvation.

12. The various passages that expressly affirm universal Salvation, where the final salvation is necessarily spoken of, afford abundant and irrefutable evidence for our peculiar doctrine. (1.) The Will of God secures the salvation of all men, as declared in 1 Tim. ii. 4–6. "Who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth. For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus; who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time." This Will, being the Will of the Omnipotent Jehovah, can not fail to be accomplished. (2.) The grace of God is said to bring salvation to all men,—taking the passage in Titus ii. 11, 12, according to the marginal reading in the Polyglott Bible.

and the authority of Dr. Adam Clarke.—"For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world." (3.) The positive declaration that God is the Savior of all men, according to his Grace and Will, is a most positive proof of our doctrine. 1 Tim. iv. 10. "For therefore we both labor and suffer reproach, because we trust in the living God, who is the Savior of all men, specially of those that believe." This "special" salvation is the present salvation of Christian believers. (4.) Finally, as denoting the Agent by which the Almighty is to accomplish his Gracious Will, in being the Savior of all men, we have the testimony of the inspired Apostle. "For we have seen and do testify that the Father sent the Son to be the Savior of the world." 1 John iv. 14. Who can resist the force of all these combined testimonies in favor of final universal Salvation?

13. Then we have the heavenly assurance in Phil. ii. 9–11, of the universal Confession that Jesus is Lord to the glory of God the Father. "Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name: that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every

tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father. Will not those be happy, who make this joyful confession?

14. And then the Ingathering of all things in one, one body, in Christ, is equivalent to universal salvation. See Eph. i. 8–10.—"Wherein he hath abounded toward us in all wisdom and prudence; having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure which he hath purposed in himself: that in the dispensation of the fulness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; even in him." This universal Ingathering in One—blessed era!—is according to God's Will; and not only so, but according to his good Pleasure; and more, his almighty Purpose—the purpose of Him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own Will. This glorious consummation is not to be effected in time, or on earth; but in the dispensation of the fulness of times. It is the ultimate condition of the human race.

15. The latter part of the 11th chapter of Romans, is most full and explicit in its declarations of the final blessedness of the whole world; and especially the last verse of the chapter, which affirms the final Return to God, of all who come from him, or subsist in him. "For of him, and through

him, and to him, are all things: to whom be glory forever. Amen." This is to succeed all the vicissitudes and changes, all the unbelief and sin, all the blinding and stumbling, all the hardening and reprobation, witnessed on earth.

16. The Deliverance of the whole Human Creation, affirmed in Rom. viii. 19–23, is most indisputably the universal Salvation for which we contend. "For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God. For the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope: because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now. And not only they, but ourselves also, which are the first-fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body." The Creature here is necessarily the whole Human Creation; for no other word or idea will fill and meet all the exigencies of the passage. What glory will redound to the name of the Universal Father, when all human intelligences shall rejoice in the glorious liberty of the sons of God! How much more worthy of Jehovah is this consummation of universal liberty and

joy, than the eternal reign of sin and death, and everlasting bondage to evil and pain!

17. The passages that unfold the doctrine of the universal Resurrection to a state of immortality, power, and glory, in the image of Jesus, and to the condition of the angels of God in heaven, constitute the mightiest pillars of the heavenly Temple of Universalism—firm as the pillars of the Eternal Throne! See Luke xx. 27–38, and 1 Cor. xv., already largely discussed in the preceding pages.

18. Connected with the universal Resurrection, or accompanying that grand event, is the universal Subjection to Christ; that God, who is love, may be All in all! See 1 Cor. xv. 24–28. God shall be All in all, and the Devil and Sin in none!

19. The testimonies of God's Word, giving an assurance of the final Destruction of all the Enemies of man, afford an immovable support to the doctrine of universal holiness and happiness. We are assured in several places, that Unbelief shall cease, Sin, Hell, the Devil, and Death be destroyed; with the additional consoling declaration that Death is man's last Enemy. See Rom. xi. 25, 26, 32, Hosea xiii. 14, John i. 29, Dan. ix. 24, 1 John iii. 8, Heb. ii. 14, 15, and 1 Cor. xv. 26, 54, 56. O! how blessed will be the condition of the universal family of God, when placed above and beyond the power of all evil influences!

20. Many passages of Scripture, not requiring to be recapitulated here, prove the certain Accomplishment of the Will, Purpuse and Design of the Almighty, relating to the final destiny of man. He cannot fail to effect his good Pleasure; nor be thwarted or frustrated by any power whatever.

21. Moreover, the entire absence of all proof of eudless misery affords presumptive evidence. even if we had no positive assurances to that effect, that all men will finally be holy and happy. What overwhelming proof would be required to establish so tremendously, so terribly awful a doctrine!—to set forth a doom that might seem to have been conceived in the souls of devils or infernal spirits!

22. The present full and complete joy and peace of Christian believers, can be afforded only by having faith in the ultimate universal reign of love and holiness. The doctrine of endless woe has crushed, and still crushes and curses myriads of human souls,—leading to sadness, despair, madness, and suicide!

23. The purest desires, the holiest aspirations, and the most fervent prayers of all good and benevolent men, all accord with the spirit and hope of our sublime Faith.—And we imagine the same to be true of the desires of angels, and the Savior, and the Universal Father himself. While the end-

[illegible]

less reign of sin and woe can be desired only by spirits of malevolence—malignant souls, human or infernal.

24. The Happiness of the Saved, requires the salvation and happiness of all.—The remediless perdition and ruin of only one soul, would forever mar the happiness of all redeemed human spirits.

25. The tendency of this heavenly, joyful, consoling, sublime Faith is to promote supreme and filial Love to God, and fraternal love to man—the great brotherhood; and this is another evidence of its truth and Divine origin.

Here then we rest. And we appeal to the candid reader whether these proofs and arguments—only a portion of the plainest and most unequivocal that might be presented—do not incontestibly demonstrate that UNIVERSALISM, in its distinguishing doctrine is the TRUTH, and according to God's Will and Word? AMEN!

THE END.

3 2044 054 746 250